

<b>COMMITTEE:</b>	<b>SCRUTINY</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>12 DECEMBER 2001</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>BEST VALUE REVIEW OF CLEANSING SERVICES</b>
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	<b>CLEANSING SERVICES BEST VALUE REVIEW TEAM</b>
<b>Ward(s):</b>	ALL
<b>Purpose:</b>	To advise Scrutiny Committee members of the outcomes of the Best Value Review of Cleansing Services
<b>Contact:</b>	Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities, Telephone 01323 415240 or internally on extension 5240.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	That Cabinet agree the Improvement Plan at 10.0

<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Summary</u></b>
<b>1.1</b>	<p>The Cleansing Services Best Value Review including Refuse Collection, Recycling, Abandoned Vehicles, Street Sweeping, Commemorative Seats and Litter Bins is now complete. Arising from the review, undertaken over eight months, is a Best Value Improvement Plan. This is at 10.0 in this report. A summary of the Improvement Plan follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To improve communication with the public by developing and maintaining Cleansing Services pages on the Council's web site further to developing eGovernment.</li> <li>2. To develop improved links with the Community by setting in place a Cleansing Services Forum to which all Community Groups will be invited to attend at which cleansing service issues may be addressed and in which Members will have a key role.</li> <li>3. To secure a quality based and most cost effective Cleansing Services Contract to be implemented by the Council in April 2003.</li> <li>4. To ensure the proper management of the tendering of the Council's Cleansing Services Contract by setting in place a Project Steering Group that will report to the Best Value Management Committee and</li> </ol>

1.2	This review has been complex. It has had to take account of a number of factors that have not only influenced the review but also its outcome and Improvement Plan.
1.3	The Improvement Plan includes matters which will influence, and be influenced by, the outcome of the tender process to commence in January 2002 for the Council's Cleansing Contract incorporating refuse collection, recycling, street sweeping, public conveniences and attendant services, and dog litter collection. This contract is due to commence in April 2003.
1.4	Another major issue which has had an effect on this review is that of the need to integrate the Borough's refuse collection and recycling services with an Integrated Waste Management Contract currently being tendered by Brighton and Hove City Council and East Sussex County Council. This Contract for the disposal of the County's waste is due to be awarded in 2002.
1.5	Further to these considerations a report was made to the Best Value Management Committee on the 25 September 2001 which sought agreement of the Committee to a revised approach for the review to that endorsed by Cabinet in April 2001.
2.0	<b><u>Introduction</u></b>

2.1	<p>The Cleansing Services Best Value Review commenced in March 2001. Membership of the Review Team has been consistent through the Review. Members of the Team include, Councillor John Stanbury, (Chairman), Councillor Ron Parsons, Ken Stevens, Federation of Small Businesses, Barrie Wennington, Resident, Ms Angela Howard, Director, South East Britain, Tidy Britain Group, Martyn Perry, Technical Manager, Waste Management ESCC, Duncan Jordan, Assistant Director of Planning and Transportation, ESCC, Mike Pashler, Works Manager, Wealden District Council, Mrs Sue McHugh, Chief Finance Officer (now Director of Finance and Corporate Services) (Sponsoring Director), Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities (Lead Officer), Paul Marsden, Cleansing Contracts Manager, Nick Ritson, Strategic Development Officer (Best Value), Diane Linsdell, Financial Strategy Accountant, Heather Tait, Recycling Officer (up until 1 September 2001), Carrol Dell, Amenities Support Assistant (Administration).</p>
2.2	<p>A list of those consulted during the course of this review is at Appendix 1.</p>
2.3	<p>Cleansing Services for the purposes of this review include refuse collection, recycling, abandoned vehicles, street sweeping, commemorative seats and litter bins. With the exception of commemorative seats these are services that all Local Authorities are required to provide by legislation.</p>
2.4	<p>The level of service provided by individual Councils does however vary and is in Eastbourne's case, a standard that seeks to meet the expectations of its residents and to support the economics of the community particularly in terms of tourism, and retail trade within the Town Centre.</p>
2.5	<p>This review has been carried out mainly on current levels of service although it is accepted that in certain regards, particularly in terms of recycling, the Council is committed to a higher performance that will seek to meet government targets in future years. This performance may be affected however by the level of financial commitment that the Council is required to make to this service, when set against its other priorities.</p>

2.6	<p>Through Residents Survey the levels of satisfaction overall for the main cleansing services are comparable with national results. The quality of the provision of the amenities service is rated highly by Eastbourne's residents compared to other services and the importance of keeping Eastbourne 'clean' is highly rated by residents.</p> <p>By providing Cleansing Services this supports the Council's Corporate Plan Vision for Eastbourne of creating "A prosperous, fair and socially inclusive community which protects people and values and enhances the environment."</p> <p>The range of services provided contribute to the Corporate Plan by seeking to make Eastbourne - A Healthy Place, A Place for Future, A Safe Place and A Place to Enjoy.</p>
2.7	<p>Key objectives specific to this service are:</p> <p>Protect public health through intervention, education and responsible action</p> <p>Keep Eastbourne clean and clear of litter and waste</p> <p>Reduce waste and develop and promote recycling and energy conservation</p>
2.8	<p>The services within this review are frontline, provided for residents, visitors and the business community and are extremely important to all.</p>
2.9	<p>A list of Background Papers used in preparing this Report is at 9.0.</p>
3.0	<p><u>Scope</u></p>

<p><b>3.1</b></p>	<p>The Review has been conducted further to Key Challenges agreed by Cabinet in April 2001.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify options for delivering the service from 2003 onwards within the current cost envelope.</li> <li>2. Consider changes to the current service, including moving from back door collection to boundary collection.</li> <li>3. Consider moving to output rather than input based specification of street sweeping standards.</li> <li>4. Explore joint provision with neighbouring boroughs.</li> <li>5. Explore innovative options for achieving recycling targets without incurring high costs.</li> <li><b>6. Develop a robust action plan to deliver recycling targets.</b></li> </ol>
<p><b>3.2</b></p>	<p>As referred to in 1.5 above, due to the complexity and influence of other factors on this review it has been necessary to reconsider the programme for meeting Key Challenges and other issues. These issues were the subject of a Report to the Best Value Management Committee on the 25 September 2001. This Report is a background paper.</p>
<p><b>3.3</b></p>	<p>At an early stage in the review the Review Team agreed an Action Plan through which the Key Challenges set by Cabinet and other relevant issues were considered. The Action Plan for each service in the review followed the following format:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is best value for the service?       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. An overview of the Council's service including statutory requirements and obligations</li> <li>B. Costs of providing the service, current service provided, benchmarking, performance indicators, public response, E Government and contractors performance</li> <li>C. Involvement of the County Council and other Councils</li> <li>D. Challenges, opportunities, options and potential changes in service provision</li> <li>E. Added value for the Council in meeting corporate Aims and Objectives, Community Safety Plan and Sustainability</li> <li>F. Outcomes/Recommendations and Improvement Action Plan</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

3.4	The Review Team considered a response for each service. Further detailed information is available on this work in the form of background papers.
4.0	<b><u>Resources</u></b>
	The Council funds the provision of Cleansing Services from within its Revenue Budgets. A financial account for each service is considered within background papers.
4.1	<b><u>Financial Resources</u></b>
4.1.1	Based on the 2001/02 Civic Budget Report the Council will make available £1,443,800 towards providing Cleansing Services within this review. This is broken down between services as shown in the table at Appendix 3.
4.1.2	The contract costs for Refuse Collection and Street Cleansing are known to be low compared with those of other authorities. When the Council tendered the Contract in 1995 the current contractor's bid was significantly less than the second lowest bid. As the contract seemed under-priced, pricing and manning levels were queried and the Council received an assurance from the contractor that the company would meet the requirements of the contract within the price quoted. These contracts end in 2003, and any subsequent contract is likely to be significantly more expensive.
4.1.3	Meetings have taken place through this Best Value Review with the current contractor and other contractors. Indications from all contractors are that the cost of a new contract based on similar levels of service to those within the existing contracts would be somewhere in the region of £400,000 over the current budget. At these meetings potential reductions to the contract sum were also discussed.

4.1.4	In addition to this there are the costs of meeting the Government's recycling targets. These potential costs are less clear, but it is estimated that these costs, along with the current under-price and possible reductions, would result in a contract sum of between £500,000 - £750,000 above the current budget. There is no guarantee however that the tender figures will not exceed this provisional budget figure.
4.2	<b><u>Human Resources</u></b>
4.2.1	Based on the 2001/02 Civic Budget Report the Council employs 5.125 full time equivalent staff on the Cleansing Services considered in this report. By comparison with other Councils in a Benchmarking Group this staffing level is lower than the average. With one Council in the Group having 8.00 full time equivalent staff.
4.2.2	Recognising the importance of the Recycling Officer role in terms of motivating the Community towards achieving recycling targets set by the Government, further survey work has been undertaken as part of this Review on staffing levels for this role. Eastbourne currently has one full time employee, employed on a short term contract by comparison with ten other Councils which all have permanent contract employees in this role.
4.2.3	Within the Improvement Plan for this review it is proposed that there is a need to create at least one permanent post of Recycling Officer to replace the current temporary post subject to available revenue funding.
4.3	<b><u>Capital Resources</u></b>
4.3.1	The Borough currently makes no capital resources available for Cleansing Services. Future capital expenditure may be considered through the tendering process of the Cleansing Services Contract to be tendered in 2002.
5.0	<b><u>Consultation</u></b>

	<p>Consultation particularly with the public is key to providing acceptable Cleansing Services. The Cleansing Group has a good reputation for effective communication with its many internal and external customers and with those whom the Group is required to consult with during the course of their work.</p>
<b>5.1</b>	<b><u>Community</u></b>
<b>5.1.1</b>	<p><b>There are established lines of communication through over 20 residents groups located within the Borough. The Cleansing Contracts Manager has worked to develop links with community groups over a number of years and has been instrumental in developing this communication network.</b></p>

<b>5.1.2</b>	<p><b>Further to this best value review a joint Forum was held in September 2001 in conjunction with the Highways Management Best Value Review which was attended by over forty people representing various community groups. It is intended that this line of communication should be developed to provide a regular Forum to which the Community will be invited to discuss topical Cleansing issues.</b></p>
<b>5.1.3</b>	<p>This Forum will be particularly useful in raising awareness of future recycling initiatives, along with other community participation through schools and the media. A higher profile role for the Recycling Officer and other support staff is seen as fundamental to this process.</p>
<b>5.1.4</b>	<p>The Cleansing Contracts Manager and his team will continue to attend and to develop communication lines with the Community Groups by attending their local meetings.</p>
<b>5.1.5</b>	<p>Prior to this review, the following surveys have been undertaken: Tenant's views on where they live; Residents Survey - September/November 2000; and Citizen's Survey March/April 1999. These surveys are background papers.</p>



5.1.6	The Cleansing Group introduced a "call logging" service in April 2001 further to the Best Value Review of Public Conveniences, a log is therefore maintained and periodically reviewed of all calls on all services provided by the Group including those within this review.
5.2	<u>Other External</u>
5.2.1	<p><b>During the course of the review officers have participated in working groups with the County Council and other Councils within East Sussex on waste management issues. These include minimisation of waste, recycling and the Integrated Waste Management Contract (IWMC) currently being tendered by Brighton and Hove City Council and East Sussex County Council. Through this process, potential tenderers for the IWMC have been interviewed by Members of the Best Value Review Team and also meetings have taken place with a number of refuse and street sweeping service providers.</b></p> <p><b>There has also been some officer and member involvement with the East Sussex Local Government Association on waste management issues. Many of these meetings are background papers.</b></p>
5.2.2	<b>The Review Team received presentations from Serviceteam, the Council's current Cleansing Contractor; ESCC on Waste Management; and Brighton and Hove City Council on Street Sweeping.</b>
5.2.3	<b>On 31 October 2001 representatives of the Best Value Inspectorate met with the Review Team together with the Cabinet members responsible for Best Value, Environment and Residential Services. A key outcome of this meeting was the innovative proposal that the planned inspection of Cleansing Services would be in two stages.</b>

5.2.4	<p><b>The first, in 2002, to assess the current service and Best Value Review and the second, in 2004, to be of the service once the new contract is operational. In this way the Council will receive an independent comparative judgement as to the success of the new contract. This arrangement is subject to agreement by the Best Value Management Committee.</b></p>
5.2.5	<p>The Review Team was fortunate to have an officer representative from Wealden District Council as a permanent member of the Team. Wealden holds Beacon Status for waste management including recycling. Comparisons were made by the Team between the two Councils and in particular the cost for refuse collection per household which in the year 1999/2000 for Eastbourne was £16.54 compared with Wealden at £41.03 with respective recycling rates of 6.8% and 8.8%. It should be noted however that the cost of collection of household waste and recycling is generally higher in rural areas for logistical reasons and the cost to Eastbourne is expected to rise considerably further to the commencement of a new Cleansing Services Contract in April 2003.</p>
5.3	<p><b><u>Internal</u></b></p>
5.3.1	<p><b>There are many Internal users of the services of the Cleansing Group. The Group dovetails in with many of the other services provided by both the Amenities Division in which it is located and also other Divisions of the Council.</b></p>
5.3.2	<p>The Group has regular communication with Environmental Health, Development Control, the Events Team in Tourism and Leisure, and Coastline Catering all of whom have fed back positively on the service provided by the Group.</p>
5.3.3	<p>As part of this review, the Review Team received a presentation from the Council's Dog Welfare Officer and further to this and other consideration this resulted in the Review Team recommending that the Council's Dog Litter Collection Service should be included within the Cleansing Contract to be tendered in 2002.</p>

5.3.4	<p>Consultation also took place with the Council's Strategy Development Officer on issues under S17 Crime and Disorder Act from which it is understood that many activities of the Cleansing Group are directly concerned with such issues. These include vehicle crime, refuse collection and street sweeping, enforcement of environmental legislation, vandalism, graffiti, public conveniences, and damage to seats and litter bins and other Council property falling within the categories of violent crime, anti social behaviour, vehicle crime and domestic burglary.</p>
6.0	<p><u>Performance</u></p>
6.1	<p><b>Through the best value review the Review Team has considered the performance of the Cleansing Group. Service is a key element in the success of this Group. From Citizen's Survey and other information on service received from the public this reflects a good standard of performance by the Cleansing Group. Overall, the levels of satisfaction are comparable with national results. The quality of the provision of the amenities services is rated highly by Eastbourne residents compared to other services. The importance of keeping Eastbourne clean is highly rated by residents. (Residents Survey November 2000) In addition, recommendations arising from this survey which are included in the Improvement Action Plan in the Report are concerned with communication with community groups, improved litter bin provision and emptying in specific areas of the Borough, and the need to improve recycling and recycling facilities.</b></p>
6.2	<p><b>It is accepted that the Group responds well to telephone calls and correspondence received. The Cleansing Group is one of the services most contacted by telephone within the Council. Call logging enables complaints and reports to be actioned and monitored efficiently. Report by locality may also be used for the purposes of evaluating trends in crime and disorder. The Cleansing Contracts Manager is working with a Vehicle Crime Group on this further to the Eastbourne Safety Partnership.</b></p>

6.3	<p>For comparison with Cleansing Groups in other Authorities a benchmarking exercise has been undertaken by comparing Eastbourne's performance with eight other Councils (Scarborough, Hastings, Lewes, Rother, Worthing, Shepway, Thanet and Christchurch.</p> <p>Benchmarking is a background paper and further information is at Appendix 2 in this Report.</p>
6.4	<p>An overview of this information for 1999/2000 suggests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Eastbourne's net cost for refuse of £16.54 per household is significantly less than the average for the Group at £22.79.</li> <li>2. The greater number of Councils in the Group provide a back door refuse collection service with only one providing a wheeled bin service.</li> <li>3. Recycling for the Group varies between 6.3% and 12.00% with Eastbourne achieving a figure of 6.80% against the Group average of 8.31% (Average of five Councils who returned a recycling figure)</li> <li>4. Eastbourne's net spend per head on Street Sweeping is £5.89 by comparison with the lowest of the Group at £4.37 and highest at £11.06 with average at £6.65.</li> <li>5. The number of reported abandoned vehicles and disposal of abandoned vehicles placed Eastbourne in the top three Councils within the Group who received the most abandoned vehicle reports and disposed of the most abandoned vehicles. During the period Eastbourne responded to 1046 reports and disposed of 546 vehicles by comparison with Worthing that received 2617 vehicles and disposed of 675.</li> <li>6. The cost of removal of abandoned vehicles varies across the Group between £17.00 and £35.00 with Eastbourne being at the upper level. (Further to this review it is anticipated that this figure will reduce for Eastbourne as revised arrangements have been set in place with the County Council that enable the Borough to reduce costs of transporting vehicles to disposal).</li> <li>7. The cost of a commemorative seat with limited maintenance in Eastbourne is £600 -£775. Seats in other Councils range between £350 and £1000.</li> <li>8. Eastbourne has the highest number of commemorative seats at 1083 with no other Council in the Group having more than 506.</li> </ol>

6.5	For the future the Council is committed to continued improvement for its Cleansing Services and in particular achieving recycling targets set by Government that include recycling/composting rates for household waste of 12% by 2003/04, 18% by 2005/06 with further increases to 30% by 2110 and 33% by 2115. Other improvements are included in 8.1 below and will be included in the Improvement Plan arising from this Review.
7.0	<b><u>Procurement and Service Options</u></b>
7.1	The Review Team has considered procurement options. In terms of the services under review this mainly applies to refuse collection and street sweeping and recycling although there are elements of purchasing involved with commemorative seats, litter bins and abandoned vehicles.
7.2	These issues are specifically dealt with within background papers. However, in general terms, the Council proposes to commence the tendering process of its refuse collection and recycling service in January 2002 for the new contract to start in April 2003. Through this Review, it has been decided to also incorporate the Council's Public Conveniences Cleansing and Attendant Services Contract and Dog Litter Collection Service Contract into this tender process.
7.3	For this Contract, the Review Team considered an option of making an 'in house' bid. The Team concluded however that although this approach should be considered again at some time in the future it would not be appropriate to adopt this approach within the Council's current structure and without the necessary Client/ Contractor split required by EU rules for procurement. A background paper is available on this.

7.4	<p>The Team also considered options of joint working with other Councils and opportunities of joint working with the County Council but concluded that these would not be viable. This is mainly for the reason that Councils have difficulty aligning contracts and advantages in joint procurement are not always apparent. The Councils of East Sussex (ESCC) and Brighton and Hove City Council (BHCC) do however undertake joint working in which all Councils in East Sussex are involved with, both now and in the future, concerned with the County's disposal of household waste through an Integrated Waste Management Contract to be jointly let by ESCC and BHCC.</p>
7.5	<p>The transportation of abandoned vehicles to disposal is currently awarded through a tender process.</p>
8.0	<p><b><u>Further consideration of Key Challenges and Future Improvements</u></b></p>
8.1	<p>As referred to above in 1.5, due to the complexity and influence of other factors on this review it has been necessary to reconsider the programme for meeting Key Challenges and other issues. The Review Team has however considered matters that will influence meeting the Key Challenges through the tender process that will be included/considered when implementing the Improvement Plan.</p> <p>The Review Team has decided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Recognising the complexities, the Council's future Cleansing Services Contract should be determined through a negotiated tender process.</li> <li>(b) It would not be appropriate for the Council to make an 'in house' bid at the present time for the Council's future Cleansing Services Contract but that such a bid should be considered at a future date dependent upon the changing needs and structure of the Council.</li> <li>(c) The Council's Dog Litter Collection Service should be included in the tender process for the Cleansing Services Contract.</li> <li>(d) The Council's Public Conveniences and Attendant Services Contract should be included in the tender process for the Cleansing Services Contract.</li> <li>(e) The duration of the next Cleansing Services Contract should be a term that will be to the best advantage of the Council recognising the likely increase in costs, particularly for recycling that may include the need for capital investment.</li> <li>(f) The phased achievement of Performance Targets should be included in the tender process, particularly for recycling, within the Cleansing Services Contract.</li> <li>(g) Best Value Indicators should be included in the</li> </ul>

(k) In order to achieve recycling targets set by the Government and in response to public demand a wheeled bin collection service should be considered in the tender process for the Cleansing Services Contract.

(l) Waste minimisation is key to the achievement of recycling targets and it is necessary for the Council, through the tender process of the Cleansing Services Contract, to consider imposing limitation on the capacity of storage facilities and collection for household refuse. (Consideration should be given to accommodating provision for an increase in waste likely to arise from larger households)

(m) Waste minimisation and education of all residents on this and recycling is paramount.

(n) Consideration should be given to creating at least one permanent post of Recycling Officer that is revenue funded to replace the current temporary post arrangement.

(o) The frequency of collection for refuse and recyclables should be determined through the tender process for the Cleansing Services Contract.

(p) The current arrangement of refuse collection from a back door collection point could be moved to boundary point collection should it be determined through the tender process for the Cleansing Services Contract that there are significant overall benefits to the outturn cost of the Cleansing Services Contract.

(q) There would be no objection in principle to a six day working week for refuse collection in the Cleansing Services Contract. (Councillor Ron Parsons abstained from voting on this decision).

(r) The number and disposition of litter bins should be determined through the tender process for the Cleansing Services Contract. (The Cleansing Contracts Manager is to undertake investigation work on this in 'trial' locations.)

(s) A protocol with the Police and improvements with the County Council to enable the more expeditious processing of potential abandoned vehicles should be pursued and included in the Improvement Plan.

(t) For the purposes of eGovernment and effective communication with the public it is necessary for Cleansing Services pages to be developed and maintained on the Council's web site.

(u) A Strategy for commemorative seats and other street furniture that may include commemorative trees and horticultural displays is to be written further to the

Seafront Strategy (June 2001) and is to be included in the Improvement Plan.

<p>8.2</p>	<p>The greater number of these decisions are concerned with the Council's future Cleansing Services Contract and will be considered through the tender process which will commence in January 2002. For the purpose of the Improvement Plan a number of these items will be brought together within specific headings that relate to the Key Challenges set by Cabinet in April 2001.</p>
<p>9.0</p>	<p><b><u>Background papers</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Report to Cabinet - Best Value - Amendments to Procedures and Programme -18 April 2001</li> <li>2. Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - Financial Breakdown</li> <li>3. Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - Minutes of Meetings of the Review Team</li> <li>4. Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - Phase 1 Analysis</li> <li>5. Refuse Collection, Recycling and abandoned Vehicles - Service Plan 2001/02</li> <li>6. Street Sweeping, Seats and Litter Bins - Service Plan 2001/02</li> <li>7. Survey - Tenant's views on where they live.</li> <li>8. Residents Survey - September/November 2000</li> <li>9. Citizen's Survey March/April 1999</li> <li>10. Best Value Review - Cleansing Action Plan - Key Challenges for the Review (Action Plan) - April 2001</li> <li>11. Eastbourne Borough Council - Civic Budget 2001-2002</li> <li>12. Cleansing Services - Performance Indicators</li> <li>13. Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - Benchmarking</li> <li>14. Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - Community Forum</li> <li>15. Report - Best Value Review Cleansing Services 2001</li> <li>16. EBC Contract -- Servicing of Dog Litter Bins and Associated Signs</li> <li>17. EBC Contract - Refuse Collection and Street Sweeping Services</li> </ol>



	<p>Management</p> <p>21. Report further to Best Value Management Committee - 16 July 2001</p> <p>22. Report to Best Value Management Committee - 25 September 2001</p> <p>23. Correspondence</p> <p>24. Report - Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - Meetings with Contractors - August/September 2001</p> <p>25. Report - Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - In House Bid for Refuse and Street Sweeping Contract</p> <p>26. Report - Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - Response to Consultation Letter - September 2001</p> <p>27. Report - Best Value Review - Cleansing Services - Dog Litter Collection Service and Provision of Dog Litter Bins - September 2001</p> <p>28. Report to Cabinet - 26 September 2001 - Public Conveniences and Attendant Services Contract</p> <p>29. East Sussex Local Government Association - Waste Management Members Group - various Reports and Papers</p> <p>30. Reports to East Sussex County Council on Waste Management and Draft Local Plan - various.</p> <p>31. Best Value - Waste Management - Learning from Inspection - Audit Commission</p> <p>32. Best Value - Waste Management - Guidance for Improving Services - Audit Commission</p> <p>33. Waste Strategy 2000 - DETR</p> <p>34. Guidance on Municipal Waste Management Strategies - DETR</p> <p>35. "Waste Not Want Not" - EBC Publication - November 2001</p> <p>Background Papers are available on request from Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities. Telephone 01323 415240 or extension 5240.</p>
--	--

<b>10.0 BEST VALUE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</b>	

<b><u>Objective</u></b>	1.  <b>To improve communication with users and potential users of the services provided by the Cleansing Group</b>	2.  <b>To improve communication between the Cleansing Group and the Community.</b>	3.  <b>To secure a quality based and most cost effective Cleansing Services Contract to be implemented by the Council in April 2003.</b>
<b><u>Action</u></b>	To develop and to maintain the Cleansing Services pages of the Council's web site with regard to developments in eGovernment	Development of improved links with the Community by the setting up of a Cleansing Forum to which all Community Groups, that represent Business and Residents, will be invited to attend at which cleansing service issues may be addressed.	To engage in a negotiated tender for the provision of Cleansing Services taking into consideration all decisions made by the Cleansing Services Review Team and Key Challenges set by Cabinet.
<b><u>Measure</u></b>	Success of Cleansing Services of web site to be evaluated by public response/public feedback and use of electronic forms contained in web pages  Number of 'hits' on web	Success of Forum to be held twice annually, measured by Attendee response and satisfaction rating in annual feedback form	Successful letting of Cleansing Services Contract that will provide a minimum standard of service at acceptable cost.
<b><u>Target</u></b>	To attract an increasing number of visitors to web pages, an exact figure to be set by Best Value Monitoring Committee for 2003/04 onwards	To attract an increasing number of attendees from groups representing the Community to successive meetings of the Forum. Targets to be set by Best Value Monitoring Committee once first years base data is collected	To identify options for delivering the services from April 2003 onwards within the current cost envelope ** (Refer to Key Challenges and issues referred to in 8.1)  ((** It should be noted that further to this review the Review Team believe that it is not realistic to be able to deliver services within the existing cost envelope.))

<b><u>Implementation Timetable</u></b>	Initial pages by April 2002 with electronic forms and complaint reporting by September 2002	Two Forums to be held during 2002/03	By March 2003
<b><u>Responsible Officer</u></b>	Paul Marsden, Cleansing Contracts Manager	Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities	Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities
<b><u>Monitoring and Reporting Arrangements</u></b>	Progress of this initiative will be monitored periodically by the Best Value Management Committee.	Progress of this initiative will be monitored periodically by the Best Value Management Committee	Progress of this initiative will be monitored periodically by the Best Value Management Committee
<b><u>Budget Implications</u></b>	Officer time from within existing resources	Officer time from within existing resources	Potential for significant increase in cost that will have to be accommodated within the Council's revenue budget.  Potential for some capital investment.
<b><u>Objective</u></b>		4  <b>To ensure the proper management of the tendering of the Council's Cleansing Contract to be tendered in 2002</b>	5.  <b>To seek to improve communication with the Community on waste minimisation and recycling, whilst providing improved security of continued employment for the current post of temporary Recycling Officer.</b>
			6.  <b>To improve joint working with other agencies to ensure the most expeditious processing of abandoned vehicles reports and removal of abandoned vehicles.</b>

<b><u>Action</u></b>	To set in place a Project Steering Group responsible to CMT	Subject to available revenue funding to establish at least one permanent post of Recycling Officer to replace the current temporary post arrangement.	A. To set in place a protocol with the Police that will enable information on vehicle ownership to be received faster than by present arrangements.  B. To set in place an agreement between the Borough and County Council that will enable the Borough to deliver abandoned vehicles direct to the County Council's disposal contractor
<b><u>Measure</u></b>	Satisfactory letting of Cleansing Services Contract	Provision of permanent Recycling Officer post.	Increase in rate of removal of abandoned vehicles to be demonstrated by performance figures
<b><u>Target</u></b>	To let Cleansing Services contract	September 2002	Implementation and protocol by December 2001
<b><u>Implementation Timetable</u></b>	For implementation planned for the 1 April 2003	Unknown	Implementation and protocol by December 2001
<b><u>Responsible Officer</u></b>	Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities, Lead Officer reporting to Project Steering Group	Mark Probyn. Head of Amenities	Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities
<b><u>Monitoring and Reporting Arrangements</u></b>  -	To report periodically to the Best Value Management Committee and Cabinet on matters determined by the Best Value Review Team in this Report and progress with the tender negotiations.	Progress of this initiative will be monitored periodically by the Best Value Management Committee.	Progress of this initiative will be monitored periodically by the Best Value Management Committee.

<b><u>Budget Implications</u></b>	Officer time from within existing resources	Potential for accommodating staffing costs within Council's revenue budget	Officer time from within existing resources  Potential for reduction in revenue spend on conveying abandoned vehicles to disposal
-----------------------------------	---	--	---

<b><u>Objective</u></b>	7.  <b>To improve visual amenity and opportunity for the provision of commemorative seats and other commemorative presentations.</b>		
<b><u>Action</u></b>	To adopt strategy further to consultation.		
<b><u>Measure</u></b>	Adoption of Strategy		
<b><u>Target</u></b>	For adoption by April 2002		
<b><u>Implementation Timetable</u></b>	April 2002		
<b><u>Responsible Officer</u></b>	Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities		
<b><u>Monitoring and Reporting Arrangements</u></b>  -	Progress of this initiative will be monitored periodically by the Best Value Management Committee		

<b><u>Budget Implications</u></b>	Officer time from within existing resources  Potential for increasing cost of commemorative seats to ensure funding for future maintenance.		
-----------------------------------	---	--	--

Appendix1				CONSULTATION & INVOLVEMENT			
<b>DIRECT INVOLVEMENT</b>							
<b>Who was involved in the review?</b>		<b>In what capacity were they involved?</b>		<b>How were they involved?</b>		<b>Were they invited to all meetings or selected ones?</b>	
Councillor John Stanbury Councillor Ron Parsons		Representatives of the Community		Participating as Members of the Best Value Review Team		All meetings	
Ken Stevens,		Representing the Business Community		Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team		All meetings	
Barrie Wennington		Representing the Community		Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team		All meetings	
Ms Angela Howard, Director, South East Britain,		Representing Tidy Britain Group		Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team		All meetings	
Martyn Perry, Technical Manager Waste Management		Representing East Sussex County Council		Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team		All meetings	
Duncan Jordan, Assistant Director of Planning and Transportation		Representing East Sussex County Council		Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team		All meetings	
Mike Pashler, Works Manager,		Representing Wealden District Council		Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team		All meetings	

Sue McHugh Director of Finance and Corporate Services (Former Head Of Finance)	Representing Corporate Management Team, Eastbourne Borough Council (Sponsoring Director)	Participating as Members of the Best Value Review Team	All meetings
Paul Marsden, Cleansing Contracts Manager	Representing Eastbourne Borough Council	Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team	All meetings
Heather Tait, Recycling Officer	Representing Eastbourne Borough Council	Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team	All meetings (up until 1 September 2001)
Nick Ritson, Strategic Development Officer (Best Value)	Representing Eastbourne Borough Council	Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team	All meetings
Diane Linsdell, Financial Strategy Accountant	Representing Eastbourne Borough Council	Participating as Member of the Best Value Review Team	All meetings
Carrol Dell, Amenities Support Assistant	Representing Eastbourne Borough Council	Administrator for the Review	All meetings
Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities	Representing Eastbourne Borough Council	Lead Officer for Review	All meetings
<b>INDIRECT INVOLVEMENT</b>			
<b>Who was consulted?</b>	<b>How were they consulted?</b>	<b>What were the results of the consultation?</b>	<b>How were results fed back to respondents?</b>
Serviceteam	Correspondence and attendance at Review Meeting	The Review Group was informed on the current Refuse and Street Sweeping Contract and performance.	Verbally via Head of Amenities
Brighton and Hove City Council	Correspondence and attendance at Review Meeting	The Review Group was informed on Street Sweeping	Verbally via Head of Amenities

East Sussex County Council	Correspondence and attendance at Review Meeting	The Review Group was informed on Waste Disposal	Verbally via Head of Amenities
Justine Armstrong, Strategic Development Officer	Attendance at Review Meeting	The Review Group were better informed on issues associated with Crime and Disorder as it relates to the work of the Cleansing Group	In person
Best Value Inspectorate	At a meeting convened to discuss progress of the review.	A key outcome of the meeting was the innovative proposal that the planned inspection of cleansing services be in two stages. The first, in 2002, to assess the current service and Best Value Review, the second, in 2004, to be of the service once the new contract is operational. In this way the Council will receive an independent comparative judgement as to the success of the new contract. This arrangement is subject to agreement by the Best Value Management Committee.	Response to Best Value Inspectorate following consideration of revised proposal for inspection of cleansing services by the Best Value Management Committee.
Residents, Community Groups	Through Community Forum	Good response to service provide by Cleansing Group	By sending written response to all questions raised during the Forum to all attendees and representatives of other Groups unable to be represented at the Forum
Residents	Through Citizen's Survey, Residents Survey and Tenants Survey	Refer to Background Papers	Refer to Background Papers
Barbara Spencer, Dog Warden	Attendance at Review Meeting	The Review Group were better informed on issues associated with the Dog Litter Collection Service and Contract and the role of the Dog Warden	Verbally via Head of Amenities



Director of Tourism, Leisure and Amenities, Head of Sport Recreation and Leisure, Head of Tourism	Via email on Strategy for Commemorative Seats	Not concluded - on going	No results to report on.
East Sussex County Council	In correspondence	Implementation of agreement for abandoned vehicles	In correspondence
Police	In correspondence	Implementation of Protocol for abandoned vehicles	In correspondence
Refuse Contractors - tenderers for the Brighton and Hove City Council and East Sussex County Council Integrated Waste Management Contract	Meeting with Head of Amenities, Cleansing Contracts Manager and Financial Strategy Accountant	Information gained to inform best value review	Communication on going with Head of Amenities
Refuse and Street Sweeping Contractors	Meeting with Head of Amenities, Cleansing Contracts Manager and Financial Strategy Accountant	Information gained to inform best value review	No feed back

<b>STAFF INVOLVEMENT</b>			
<b>What members of staff were on the review team?</b>	<b>How were they selected?</b>	<b>What involvement did they have?</b>	<b>How were other members of staff involved in the review?</b>
Paul Marsden, Cleansing Contracts Manager	By Head of Amenities	As advisor to the Team	By meetings through course of the review with all staff in the Cleansing Group and also Amenities Division
Carrol Dell, Amenities Support Assistant	By Head of Amenities	Administrator	N/A
Mark Probyn, Head of Amenities	By CMT	Lead Officer	By meetings through course of the review with all staff in the Cleansing Group and also Amenities Division

Appendix 2										PERFORMANCE COMPARISON (1999/2000)
	Eastbourne	Scarborough	Hastings	Lewes	Rother	Worthing	Shepway	Thanet	Christchurch	
Number of staff to supervise service	5.125	4.5	5.25	7.25	7.5	7.5	8	7.25	4.25	
Net cost of Refuse Collection per Household	£16.54	£30.79	£23.98	£25.42	£30.51	£22.99	£17.29	£19.95	£17.64	
Number of Hereditaments	42,175	52,182	Not available	40,500	41,428	46,000	45,000	59,900	21,000	
Type of Refuse collection	Back door	Wheel bin	Back door	Back door	Back door	Back Door	Black Bag	Curtilage	Back Door	
Annual tonnage of Household waste collected	27,359	41,155	Not available	27,144	31,000	29,210	33,000	Not available	128,00	
Annual tonnage of waste recycled	1,860	4,762	Not available	Not available	3,060	3,739	2,500	Not available	1,874	

<b>Annual Recycling rate of Household waste %</b>	6.80%	11.86%	6.30%	6.80%	9.80%	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
<b>Type of Collection service for recycling</b>	Mix kerb and bring	Bring Sites	Mix kerb and bring	Bring Sites	Bring sites	Mix kerb and bring	Mix kerb and bring	Bring sites	Kerbside 3000 props
<b>Service contracted out or DSO</b>	Contracted out	DSO	Contracted out	D S O	Contracted out	D S O	Contracted out	Contracted out	D S O
<b>Net spend per head on Street Sweeping</b>	£5:89	£9.60	£11:06	£5:11	£6:01	£4:37	£5:96	£7:19	£4:64
<b>Type of Street Sweeping EPA or Frequency</b>	Frequency	Combination	Combination	Combination	Combination	Combination	Frequency	Frequency	E P A
<b>Tonnage of arisings (From Street Sweeping)</b>	10% of waste collected	Not available	Not available	1,520	3,060	2,433	3,600	Not available	380

<b>Number of Vehicles reported as abandoned</b>	1046	555	Not available	800	589	1,450	2,617	Not available	160
<b>Number of abandoned vehicles sent for disposal</b>	546	543	Not available	400	268	1,131	675	Not available	75
<b>Cost to remove an abandoned vehicle</b>	£35	£20	Not available	£17	£25	£20	Unavailable	Not available	£25
<b>Total number of litter bins</b>	280	1,240	Not available	500	650	742	700	650	120
<b>Average empties per day of litter bins</b>	Up to 5 times	Up to 7 times	Not available	4 times	up to 3 times	More than 4 times	up to 3 times	Not available	Up to 4 times
<b>Presentation seats type</b>	Wood	Not applicable	Not available	Wood	Wood	Wood / Metal	Wood	Not applicable	Wood / metal
<b>Cost of seat to Donor</b>	£850	Not applicable	Not available	£350	£375	£1,000	£600	Not applicable	£1,000

<b>Total number of seats maintained</b>	1083	Not applicable	Not available	200	150	506	410	Not applicable	300
---	------	----------------	---------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----------------	-----

<b>Appendix 3</b>	<b>EXPENDITURE HEADS</b>
-------------------	--------------------------

Based on the 2001/02 Civic Budget Report the Council will make available £1,443,800 towards providing Cleansing Services within this review. This is broken down between services and expenditure heads as follows:

	<u>Refuse Collection</u>	<u>Recycling</u>	<u>Street Cleansing</u>	<u>Seats &amp; Litter Bins</u>	<u>Total</u>
Employees		17,600			<b>17,600</b>
Premises				13,550	<b>13,550</b>
Transport					<b>0</b>
Suppl And Serv		400		4300	<b>4,700</b>
Contract Payments	780,000		641,000		<b>1,421,000</b>
Support Services	74,950	2000	74950	37500	<b>189,400</b>
ESCC contribution	(60,000)		(12,750)		<b>(72,750)</b>
Other		(18,100)	(97,250)	(14,350)	<b>(129,700)</b>
	794,950	1,900	605,950	41,000	<b>1,443,800</b>