PUBLIC REALM AND WORKS SERVICES UNIT TASK GROUP – 12 OCTOBER 2010

A meeting of the Public Realm and Works Services Unit Task Group will be held at 5.30pm on Tuesday 12 October 2010 in Committee Room 1 at the Town Hall, Rugby.

Doug Jones
Head of Business Transformation

A G E N D A

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Minutes - to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2010.
2. Apologies – to receive apologies for absence from the meeting.
3. Declarations of Interest.
   To receive declarations of –
   (a) personal interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;
   (b) prejudicial interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors; and
   (c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.
4. Works Services Unit External Charging Proposals.
PART 2 – EXEMPT INFORMATION

There is no business involving exempt information.

*Any additional papers for this meeting can be accessed here via the website.*

Membership of the Task Group:

Councillors Day, Gillias, Kirby, Mistry, Ms Robbins, Roodhouse, Sewell, Helen Walton.

*If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Linn Enticott, Democratic Services Officer (01788 533523 or e-mail linn.enticott@rugby.gov.uk). Any specific queries concerning reports should be directed to the Scrutiny Unit (01788 533591 or e-mail Scrutiny@rugby.gov.uk)*

*If you wish to attend the meeting and have any special requirements for access please contact the Democratic Services Officer named above.*
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There are no equality and diversity implications as a result of this report.
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This review has the potential for far-reaching positive financial implications across the whole council.

Risk Management Implications
There are no risk management implications as a result of this report.

Environmental Implications
There are no environmental implications as a result of this report.

Legal Implications
The task group will need to be aware of legal requirements in respect of matters such as contracts and transfers of undertakings.
Report of Public Realm & WSU Task Group

12 October 2010

WSU External Charging Proposals

Summary
The report provides Members with proposals allowing the WSU to offer services to the general public and other public bodies externally.

1. Introduction

The Work Services Unit (WSU) at Rugby Borough Council (the Council) is keen to generate additional income from other sources in particular from third parties. The WSU is not a separate legal entity but is part of Rugby Borough Council. This document sets out the criteria needing to be considered prior to the WSU opening up its services and either bidding for external public work or charging for works within legal boundaries.

2. Professional Advice

As mentioned at the last meeting number of Officers of the Council attended a one day income generation workshop provided by Eversheds. Officers are now well aware of the correct and proper routes to use when charging for services.

3. Powers to Charge

At the September meeting of this Task Group Members were informed of the powers open to local authorities that allow them to charge for services. These powers were:

- Section 1 Local Authorities (Goods & Services) Act 1970.
- Section 111 Local Government Act 1972
- Section 93 Local Government Act 2003

Two of the Acts that give Local Authorities the power to charge are directly applicable to the WSU (and other parts of the Council) and can provide business opportunities, these are;

Section 1 Local Authorities (Goods & Services) Act 1970, provides the WSU with the ability to charge other public bodies for the provision of services and legally make a profit. This Act opens up significant options for the WSU as it is in the position to act as service provider to other local authorities for major services. It is not inconceivable to consider the possibility of Rugby Borough Council carrying out refuse/recycling or street cleansing activities for another Warwickshire district council or operating the local civic amenity/recycling centre on behalf of the County Council, and;
Section 93 Local Government Act 2003, under the terms of this Section, local authorities may charge a person for the provision of discretionary services. A discretionary service is a service, which the authority does not have a duty to provide, but may voluntarily decide to perform. Authorities can charge "as they see fit". Charging only some people or charging different groups of people different amounts is permitted, provided over the course of a year income and expenditure figures tally. Although this Act prohibits the Council from making a profit from the provision of discretionary services it can base its charges quite legitimately on a 'total cost plus' basis, this would allow a proportion of central establishment costs to be included within the actual charge for the service, this would in itself reduce the Council’s overall expenditure on all services.

The WSU is presently considering setting up an MOT station for its forty or so class 4 vehicles (small vans etc) this act would allow the WSU to open this service up to the general public and businesses, in support of this action it is noted that recently the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government publicly announced that local authorities should open up their internal MOT stations to local residents.

4. Services Provided

The WSU is in a position to offer the following services through ‘charging’ legislation, although not a comprehensive list it provides Members with outline of the possible areas that can be exploited.

Environmental and Minor Construction Services such as;
Repairs and maintenance to commercial and residential properties,
Driveway construction,
Block Paving,
Car Park construction
Building cleaning,
Grounds maintenance,
Commercial recycling (including confidential paper shredding),
Graffiti removal,
Bin cleaning service,
Litter picking,
Removal of fly-tips and fly-posting from private premises,
Drain clearance, and
Vehicle maintenance and MOT’s

5. Benefits to the Council and the WSU

- To sell, at a profit, the Environmental Services currently offered by the Council, to other public bodies as allowed under section 1 Local Authorities (Goods & Services) Act 1970. The income generated could either assist with the Councils financial situation or be invested in other council initiatives.
- To be flexible to take advantage of trading opportunities that may arise for all Council services.
- To improve service provision through developing alternative skills
- To reinforce in-house services and ensure that the current expertise is maintained and kept up to date.
• To increase the profile of the Council.
• To provide a more balanced workload throughout the year.
• To stretch and motivate staff within the WSU, by providing experience of working in a more commercial context.
• To future-proof the Council’s service delivery.

6. The Way Forward
In light of the proposal for the WSU to commence external charging services, Officers consider that an internal assessment team comprising of the Head of Environmental Services, the General Manager of the WSU, the Financial Services Manager and the Legal and Election Services Manager be set up. It will be the responsibility of this team to carefully consider any proposed external charging activity to ensure that the following questions are positively answered;

• What are the aims/objectives of the proposal
• Does the proposal benefit the wider community
• Has the legal basis for the activity been identified
• Has market analysis on the activity been carried out
• What is the impact upon the local economy
• Has a robust business case been produced
• Does the proposal have regard to the Council’s Policy on Risk Management
• Is the Council able to fund the set-up costs

Only if the assessment team is completely satisfied that the proposal meets all of the above will it be forwarded to Cabinet for the final decision whether to implement. An example of how this may be undertaken has been included as appendix 1 for the purpose of illustration for the expansion of a commercial recycling service.

Should the WSU decide to embark on securing a contract with another public body under section 1of the Local Authorities (Goods & Services) Act 1970, it would be prudent to co-opt the Human Resources Manager onto the assessment team. Under such contracts staff may be transferred to the Council under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 1981 (as amended) (TUPE) and this will need to be ascertained and the terms and conditions upon which the transfer will take place. In addition the provisions of TUPE may also impact on the transfer of staff at the end of any contract.

7. Conclusion
Charging for discretionary services could provide the Council with much needed income in these times of financial austerity. The WSU is well placed to provide a number of services in the borough and beyond, the control method described within the report should protect the Council from risk as well as ensuring that the WSU only take on services that serve the public and there is an actual need for.

The Task and Finish group may wish to consider recommending to Cabinet that the appraisal approach for charging activities be promoted across all the Council’s services.
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## APPRAISAL FOR CHARGING ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Commercial Recycling Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the aims/objectives of the proposal</td>
<td>To provide a commercial recycling service for commercial and Industrial businesses in the Borough. To increase the customer base for the Council's commercial waste service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal benefit the wider community</td>
<td>Yes, it will support and assist businesses in managing their waste arisings in a way that minimises environmental impact. It will also provide the potential to reduce the costs for business when managing their waste arisings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the legal basis for the activity been identified</td>
<td>Yes, under Section 45 (1b) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 “It shall be the duty of each waste collection authority …. if requested by the occupier of premises in its area to collect any commercial waste from the premises, to arrange for the collection of the waste.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has market analysis on the activity been carried out</td>
<td>Yes. The Council currently operates a commercial waste collection service, which serves approximately 1000 customers. This service receives regular requests from existing businesses and representative groups to provide a recycling service. A small scale operation currently services around 30 town centre properties for cardboard only. We know that a number of businesses use our recycling bring facilities to dispose of commercial recyclate, which is in contravention of the law. There is an existing competitive commercial environment for these services with a number of national and local companies in the market. We do lose business to our competitors as we are unable to offer a full recycling service, this potentially damages the long term viability of the commercial waste service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact upon the local economy</td>
<td>The provision of this service would enable local businesses to potentially reduce their operating costs marginally and assist them in operating in compliance with the duty of care regulations on waste management. The existing market would not be disproportionately affected by the council’s expansion in this activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a robust business case been produced</td>
<td>Not at this stage, there is insufficient capacity available to the Council at this time, but from April when we implement a 4 day working week for the domestic recycling and refuse service this would enable the expansion in to this field. A robust business case would be prepared early in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal have regard to the Council's Policy on Risk Management</td>
<td>Yes. The expansion is low risk as no new plant or equipment is required. Operational costs would be managed through payment of additional hours to volunteers, so there are no permanent additional staffing costs to be considered. The service must achieve cost recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Council able to fund the set-up costs</td>
<td>Yes, these can be met from existing WSU resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal review Group decision</td>
<td>Approve / Reject / Further information (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Internal Review Group Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to Cabinet (if required)</td>
<td>Approve / Reject / Amend / Further Information (Specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formal Approval for implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary
This report presents the draft report of the review group. Attached are comments that have been received, members are asked to finalise their review report and complete the Action Plan.

1 Introduction

This is scheduled to be the last meeting of the Task Group.

A draft review report has been circulated for members prior to the meeting. A copy and a draft action plan are attached.

Any recommendations arising from the report on charging will be added before the report is finalised.

It is intended that the report will be submitted to Corporate Performance Committee on 11th November and Cabinet on 22nd November 2010.
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Chairman
The following potential improvements also need to be considered in terms of how they might be achieved, what sort of time scale and costs might apply. The recommendations will need to be turned into an achievable action plan which the relevant officers have been able to comment on.

The Task Group proposes the following:

### SIGNIFICANT PROPOSALS THAT WILL REQUIRE COMMITMENT OF TIME OR/AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The task Group endorses the operations of the Works Service Unit and recommends that it is kept as an in house service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officers from the unit should work together with legal and financial officers to expand the services that can be offered on a “charged for” basis. These should include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of garage to allow MOTs to be carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing Handyman Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand the commercial recycling service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future expansion of services be encouraged, providing a market analysis and a business case have been prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The review group endorse any future plans to set up a company for any part of the unit where it would consider it beneficial to have full powers to trade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPROVEMENTS THAT COULD BE MADE QUICKLY AND AT LOW COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developers should be contacted and informed of their legal responsibilities in clearing litter from development sites. Farmers and Farm contractors should also be reminded of their responsibilities to keep highways clear of debris.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consideration should be given to future street cleansing contracts with a view to reducing levels of detritus in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There needs to be a system of education to inform the public that the cleansing of all open spaces is not the responsibility of the Council if the land is private.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All parish councils should be given environmental action forms on an annual basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MODIFICATIONS OF EXISTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

|   | Provide greater education on the problem of litter rather than using enforcement as a solution to littering. A anti litter campaign could be useful in targeting the issue of educating the public. |
2 There is a need to be more proactive and to encourage the public to report littered areas.

3 Consideration be given to introducing some street bins for recyclables.
   Performance Indicators be developed for grounds maintenance, based on visual presentation of the green spaces. Members of the public could be recruited as champions to report on these standards. Supporting aims could be to improve the number of green flag awards held and improved ratings in Heart of England in Bloom, Greenstat returns and peer reviews from other authorities.

4 WSU consider expanding the vehicle workshop to undertake private commercial work to boost income generation.

5 The commercial recycling charging be re-evaluated to develop potential for expansion of the service and boost income generation.

7 A separate review proposal on encouraging community involvement be submitted to the scrutiny workshop 2011.

Note: Recommendations are not listed in order of priority within each category.

2. OBJECTIVES

The relevant LAA theme delivery block is Climate Change & the Environment

This review relates to priorities 4 and 5 of Rugby Borough Council’s Strategic Objectives.

Priority 4 is to “enable and sustain an environment which our residents can take pride in and which impress our visitors.”

Priority 5 is to “enable the delivery of excellent VFM services in line with our corporate plans.”

2.1 One Page Strategy

The specific topic area of the review was to examine the costs and benefits of retaining the delivery of services using the WSU compared with external providers. In order to ensure value for money in the provision of the Public Realm service and increase community involvement in the preservation and improvement of the local environment.

This involved looking at the following in relation to refuse and recycling, street cleansing and grounds maintenance (including work for the housing service): The aim was to
1. Identify the extent to which the current service level agreement (SLA) with the WSU delivers value for money, using the Audit Commission VFM assessment framework of:
   - cost and efficiency
   - quality and impact
   - performance and delivery
   - customer satisfaction

2. Identify the gap between actual and potential performance and ways in which value for money may be improved, including consideration of generation of additional income from outside the council.

3. Make clear recommendations on the options for delivering Public Realm services from April 2013 and increasing the involvement of the public in civic pride.

2.2 The Role of the Works Services Unit

The WSU provides the following Services:

- Refuse and Recycling
- Street Cleansing
- Grounds Maintenance
- Vehicle Maintenance Workshop
- Highways/Construction Services
- Public Conveniences.
- Waste Transfer Facilities

Plus other minor ancillary services.

2.3 Value for Money Terms of Reference

The Audit Commission has a systematic structure for assessing value for money. This involves gathering quantitative and qualitative evidence on:

- cost
- actual performance and delivery
- customer satisfaction
- quality and impact

What is Value for Money?

“The achievement of economy, efficiency and effectiveness in all activities”

Council services must be provided at the right quality, level and cost for the needs of our customers and the local community. The Council’s overall performance is reviewed and publicly reported by the Audit Commission through Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA).

It is essential that the Council can clearly demonstrate continuous improvement in:-

• The cost of services and efficiency in delivering them
• The quality and impact of services provided
• The performance and delivery of our services
• Customer satisfaction with services

By conducting value for money assessments, the Council is taking active steps to improve its own awareness of the value for money it is providing. These assessments and the improvements made as a result will be used as key evidence in the external assessment of the Council.

3. RELATIONSHIP TO LOCAL POLICY FRAMEWORK

3.1 Refuse & Recycling

3.1.1 Local Strategic Partnership

Refuse and recycling fits within the ‘climate change and environment’ block of Rugby’s LSP. Specifically, strategic priority 3 which is “Reduce the amount of Bio-degradable Waste going to Landfill and Improve Waste Management Practices.” The key targets of this strategic priority are:

- Improve Dry Recycling Collection Rates.
- Improve Organic Waste Collection Service & Increase Collection Rates.
- Improve Fuel Efficiency of Refuse/Recycling Fleet & Reduce Emissions.

3.1.2 Corporate Strategy

The Council’s Corporate Strategy established the overarching strategic objective of making the Borough ‘Clean, Green & Safe’ and in order to make a major contribution toward the ‘Green’ element the Council has implemented a major step-change in the way recycling & refuse services are delivered.

Within the core strategy refuse and recycling is attached to priority 4 which is to “enable and sustain an environment which our residents can take pride in and which impresses our visitors.” Following public consultation the relevant key aim to refuse and recycling that was requested was to develop high-quality easy-to-use recycling services.

**Target:** Increase the % of household waste re-cycled and composted from 36.4% in 2008/09 to 42% in 2010/11.

3.1.3 LAA

It has long been the Council’s ambition to be in the top quartile of all local councils in terms of recycling services and the new services were designed and planned to take into account residents expectations together with a means of achieving high diversion rates for recycling & composting ensuring that our current and future
recycling targets as defined in the LAA and any future Government targets are not only met but exceeded.

The main target within the LAA is in the block: Climate Change and the Environment. Specifically it is under E4 which is “reduced waste to landfill and increase recycling.” This can be focused on 2 sub targets: Increase the % of municipal waste recycled/composted: Increase the proportion of household waste recycled through an increase in the recycling of glass, metal, plastic and some textiles.

3.2 Street Cleansing

3.2.1 Local Strategic Partnership

There are three areas of the Local Strategic Partnership that focus on Street Cleansing. They are: stronger communities, children and young people, and climate change and the environment. All three discuss the need for communities to be proactive in helping to keep a clean and tidy Rugby. The Local Strategic Partnership promotes working together not just as a community but also with Rugby Borough Council. This helps to support the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

3.2.2 Corporate Strategy

Corporate priority number 4 which states: “Enable and sustain an environment which our residents can take pride in and which impresses our visitors.” Breaking this down into its 7 key aims there are 3 that should be taken into consideration. The three are listed below along with their agreed targets for 2009/10:

1. Clear up the results of environmental crimes such as litter, graffiti, fly-tipping, dog fouling, chewing gum and abandoned vehicles.

   Target – to secure improvements against national indicators

2. Develop an education and enforcement campaign programme to reduce environmental crime and anti-social behaviour.

   Target: Increase the numbers of enforcement actions undertaken regarding environmental crimes from 50 in 2008/09 to 150 in 2010/11.

3. Develop high quality easy to use recycling services

   Target- to increase the % of household waste recycled and composted to 42% by 2010/11.

3.2.3 LAA

Within Block 6 (Climate Change & the Environment) the key target is within E5 which is the quality of the built environment. There are 4 separate aims:

1. The % of relevant land and highways that has accumulations of litter etc that fall below an acceptable standard.

2. The % of people satisfied with a cleanliness standard in their area.
3. The % of abandoned vehicles removed within 24 hours.
4. The year on year decrease in the number of reported incidents relating to fly tipping on Highway and public land.

3.3 Grounds Maintenance

3.3.1 Local Strategic Partnership

The LSP has several aims that are related to Grounds Maintenance. The first is having “an attractive and accessible network sustainably-managed green spaces and green corridors.” Within this aim the role of grounds maintenance is not to physically look after Biodiversity. Instead, its need is to make sure that those areas are up kept by services such as hedgerow cutting.

The second aim within the LSP relating to grounds maintenance is having a “high quality local environment that is clean and attractive.” The role of grounds maintenance in this objective is to keep public areas clean and looking well presented such as grass cutting in Caldecott Park.

3.3.2 Corporate Strategy

Priority 4 provides a base for grounds maintenance and targets to achieve. Point 5, ‘provide high quality usable public spaces’, has an aim of ‘produce and implement management plans for all public spaces. The aim is to have 150 sites briefed and fully implemented by 2011.

3.3.3 LAA

Cleaner and Greener Pg129. E8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liveability</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines 2006/07 (unless otherwise stated)</th>
<th>Targets 2007/08 (including any stretch targets &amp; their annual unstretched targets)</th>
<th>Targets 2008/09 (including any stretch targets &amp; their annual unstretched targets)</th>
<th>Targets 2009/10 (including any stretch targets &amp; their annual unstretched targets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the Quality of all local parks, nature reserves &amp; peoples’ neighbourhoods</td>
<td>(i) % of residents satisfied with the local authority cultural services (e) Parks &amp; Open Spaces.</td>
<td>BV 119e Citizens Panel (WCC) Satisfaction Surveys (E8IPOO 2006) Baseline 62.9%</td>
<td>Surveys Every 67% 72% 77%</td>
<td>Surveys Every 67% 72% 77%</td>
<td>Surveys Every 67% 72% 77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) % of residents reporting an increase in satisfaction with their neighbourhoods & in disadvantaged areas showing a narrowing of the gap between these areas & the rest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BV 119e Citizens Panel (WCC) Satisfaction Surveys (E8iiPSS 2006) Baseline 78.2%</th>
<th>Surveys Every</th>
<th>3 Years</th>
<th>Coordinated Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 The Review took place between January 2010 and October 2010.

4.2 In order to develop the evidence base for the review, the Group met with the following individuals:

**Rugby Borough Council Officers**

Paul Larcombe Public Realm Manager
Sean Lawson Head of Environmental Services
Andy Smith Works Services General Manager
Wayne Knighton Operations Manager
Paul Mernagh Street Scene Team Leader
Deborah Middlemiss Grounds Maintenance Manager
Gill Russell Environment and Waste Services Manager
Chris Worman Parks and Open Spaces Team Leader

**External Witnesses**

Officers from Sevenoaks District Council

4.3 **Programme of Review**

The review was divided into the following components:-

**Phase 1**
Value for money; refuse & recycling
Street cleansing
Grounds maintenance
General improvements and other work areas
External income opportunities
Public involvement, civic pride

**Phase 2**
4.4 The review group considered the viewpoints of the local community. Specifically these were detailed in the responses on the waste management survey which had been conducted between October and December 2009.

A copy of which is attached as Appendix 1.

4.5 Officers and the Chairman of the Group visited the Sevenoaks WSU to look at the various operations carried out by them. Sevenoaks having been rated an excellent authority in this field.

4.6 The agendas, reports and minutes relating to this review can be found online at www.rugby.gov.uk, following the links to the Committee Papers system and then clicking on Public Realm & WSU Task Group and selecting the relevant meeting dates.

5. FINDINGS

This section sets out the review’s findings.

5.1 Refuse & Recycling

The current refuse and recycling service has only been in operation since April 2009. The new service switched to fortnightly collections and increased the range of materials that were collected from households.

5.1.2 Performance-Facts and Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers of Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulky Waste Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring Site Collections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year on year comparisons: Value for Money (Cost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operational cost - net</th>
<th>Overall Recycling Rate</th>
<th>Cost per % point recycled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/7</td>
<td>£2,112,000</td>
<td>24.18%</td>
<td>£87,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/8</td>
<td>£2,129,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>£81,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/9</td>
<td>£2,550,000</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>£76,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>£2,460,000*</td>
<td>58%**</td>
<td>£42,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projected net cost  
** Projected outturn

Missed Bin Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Missed</th>
<th>Per 10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 March- June</td>
<td>1,152,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 July- Oct</td>
<td>1,224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 March- June</td>
<td>1,184,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 July-Oct</td>
<td>1,258,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 March- June</td>
<td>1,372,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 July-Oct</td>
<td>1,351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 March-June</td>
<td>996,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 July-Oct</td>
<td>1,058,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Changeover in collection day

5.1.3 Public Comment on performance

Following the introduction of the new refuse and recycling service a waste management survey was carried out between October and December 2009. The group considered the draft results of the survey, a summary of which is attached as Appendix 1.

5.1.4 Public Consultation on change in the service

In June 2007, following the Audit Commission Inspection of Waste Management services, a refuse and recycling survey to ascertain residents’ opinions on the options available for a step change in recycling was sent out on a random basis to 10,000 homes resulting in 3068 replies.

Five options were offered in the survey in terms of how the new services could be delivered; however the option with most support was ‘no change’ to existing services. In reality this was not an option as it would not meet current and future statutory targets for recycling. The option chosen in second place was the three bin service that subsequently received unanimous support by all Members.

Plans for the implementation of the new service began in July 2008 and involved partnership working with the Government body WRAP (Waste Resource Action Programme) to produce a Communication Plan, Warwickshire County Council for financial support to provide vehicles, bins and kitchen caddies, and for the provision of infrastructure in terms of an In-Vessel Compost Unit for processing green / food waste. We have entered into partnership working with our Material Reclamation Facility provider – Pure Recycling.

5.1.5 Collection round re-scheduling

Introduction of the new service provided an opportunity to re-schedule the collection rounds which had not been adjusted for more than 10 years. This had resulted in an imbalance on some rounds and the requirement of an additional vehicle and crew to travel ‘all over the place’ collecting from new housing developments; be that a new estate or merely in-fill housing on existing estates.
The new rounds were zoned meaning that the whole of a particular area is collected in a single day as opposed to the same vehicle collecting that area over 5 days. The re-scheduling meant over 26,000 homes had their collection day changed and a decision was made to carry out the round changes 4 weeks prior to the new service commencing. This gave residents an opportunity to get used to a new collection day and the collection crews to get used to their new rounds prior to the new service starting. In addition any ‘teething’ problems on the new rounds would not be portrayed as an issue relative to the new service.

5.1.6 Delivering the new service

In order to deliver the new service a Communication Plan was produced. The Communication Plan concentrated on ‘paid for’ promotional activities in terms of advertising; leaflets, billboards, radio, newspapers etc and was delivered accordingly.

5.1.7 Communications Activity Schedule

A communications activity schedule was compiled to record drop-in events at Village Halls, road-shows in the Town Centre and local supermarkets. A local schools competition was held to design a poster to be used as livery on four of the new collection vehicles. A ‘Slim your Bin” Challenge was held with four families, covering a cross section of the community, being involved.

Media coverage of the new service was very positive and unlike experiences from many other Authorities we did not receive the ‘fortnightly collection’ backlash, the Council actively worked with the media to illustrate the new service in a positive way.

The Council’s communications team with their specific knowledge of marketing were very involved throughout and using their expertise certainly had a positive effect on the press coverage and other media coverage.

To coincide with the mail drops a series of press releases and articles were published in local newsletters for example the Tenant Times. Councillors were also frequently updated via e-mail and newsletter.

5.1.8 Tailored Services and Communications

A series of information leaflets were sent out to all residents starting in January 2009 with an introduction leaflet; briefly explaining the new service and letting residents know the time-plan for the roll-out.

A second leaflet was delivered to all homes at the same time as the new recycling bins and kitchen caddies were delivered; approximately 4-5 weeks before the start date.

A final Instruction leaflet with collection calendar was mailed out approximately 3 weeks before the service started.

It was always apparent that some residents would have difficulty in storing three bins. As a result 1500 letters were sent out to residents in areas
identified as possibly having a problem with storage. The introduction leaflet informed residents how to contact us should they think they may have a problem accommodating the bins. All responding residents (87) were contacted and a solution agreed either by phone conversation with a follow up confirmation letter or where necessary a site visit was carried out to their home. Options available included smaller bins or retention of red boxes for storing dry recycling. This work is on-going if bins are found left on the street residents are contacted and asked if they need any help or advice or alternative storage facilities.

Site visits were carried out to apartments, flats and sheltered housing complexes, and mobile home parks to discuss options in order to ensure that the service is as inclusive as possible.

5.1.9 Involving Residents

In order to involve as many residents as possible and covering a wide range of ethnic and disability groups over sixty drop-in and road-show events were held; for example Parish Councils, Rugby Mind Group, Rugby Disability Forum, Guidepost Carer Support Group, Benn Partnership Centre, M.S Society, Mayday Trust, Rugby Race & Disability Forum. In addition written information leaflets regarding the new service have been produced in large print for the visually impaired and the final instruction leaflet will be available in abbreviated format in Polish, Portuguese, Guajarati and Punjabi. Finally, this will be transposed onto audio tape.

Officers worked with specific disability groups to ensure the design of the blue bin supports those with visual impairment.

5.1.10 Involving Staff

Council staff were involved from the early planning stage. There were a series of staff briefings which all staff were invited to attend.

Specific training was carried out with Contact Centre Staff and several weeks before the additional bins were delivered a ‘3 Bin Team’ specifically employed to take calls regarding the new service. This team of dedicated staff went out with the crews watching and helping with delivery of the new bins and to see the service being implemented from the operational side. Overall they had a very thorough training on all aspects of the new service.

5.1.11 Involving Councillors

Members played a critical role in ensuring consistent and supportive communications with residents and many have featured key messages leading up to the implementation of the service in constituency communications, surgeries and locality forums.

5.1.12 Contact Centre – Calls
As part of the implementation plan a dedicated team of staff was recruited to assist the public in understanding the new service and respond to queries that would inevitably occur.

### Call volumes – refuse & recycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Refuse &amp; Recycling Calls Offered</th>
<th>Refuse &amp; Recycling Calls Answered</th>
<th>3 Bin Service Calls Offered</th>
<th>3 Bin Service Calls Answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2006-</td>
<td>16705</td>
<td>15566</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2007-</td>
<td>20262</td>
<td>18166</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2008-</td>
<td>20664</td>
<td>17320</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009-</td>
<td>5279</td>
<td>4264</td>
<td>8459</td>
<td>6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009*</td>
<td>(3 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* First quarter new service operational

### 5.1.13 First Collections

In some cases residents had received their recycling bin up to 4 weeks before the new service started so there was a degree of ‘stock-piling’ of material. On the first collection of the new service excess materials for recycling or composting were also taken.

During the first few weeks many of the collection crews were not completing the round until 6-6.30pm and the volume of the dry recycling far exceeded expectation.

### 5.1.14 Results

In the first 8 weeks of the service the overall recycling / composting rate achieved was 62%. (Detail below)

Refuse collection 2403 tonnes
Dry (co-mingled) recycling 1793 tonnes
Green & food 2278 tonnes

Dry recycling rate of 27%
Composting rate of 35%
And a combined rate of 62%

Allied to the increase in materials being recycled, it important to note that there has been a 41% reduction of wastes being sent to landfill.

**Final outturn figures for 2009/10 were**
Dry (co-mingled) recycling 10657.83 tonnes
Green & food 10004.18 tonnes

Dry recycling rate of 27.71%
Composting rate of 26%

### 5.1.15 2009 Survey Results

In winter 2009 Rugby Borough Council carried out a waste management survey. 772 questionnaires were competed via the following methods – Citizen’s Panel (515), Booster Survey (131) and an Online Survey (131) via the RBC website.

With 93% indicating that they recycle either ‘slightly’ or ‘a lot more’ it is possible to infer that the new service has provided a greater value-for-money.

Almost three quarters of those asked said they had not had any problems with the service which suggests the service is moving in the right direction. Of those who did have problems over 75% felt they were either ‘fairly’ or ‘very satisfied’ with the way that it was resolved.

When informed that the refuse and recycling service costs £1 per week, the responses were very positive. Around 85% of those asked either agreed or strongly agreed that this service was proving to be Value-For-Money.

The Group considered a comprehensive summary of Performance Indicators which is attached as **Appendix 3**.

### 5.2 Street Cleansing

#### 5.2.1 Performance Reporting

The Government introduced a Best Value Performance Indicator in 2003 to provide a measure of the cleanliness of the streets and environment in local authorities. It required formal assessments of street and open space cleanliness to be undertaken at 300 sites across the Borough, to be repeated three times per year. This indicator was replaced in April 2008 by the National Indicator 195 (NI 195) which involves grading four separate elements: litter, detritus, graffiti and fly-posting. (See **Appendix 3**).

#### 5.2.2 The LAA and Street Cleansing
NI 195 is one of the chosen countywide indicators on the Local Area Agreement (LAA). The Tidy Britain Group who administer this indicator nationally on behalf of DEFRA has recently provided funding to the five districts/boroughs of Warwickshire in order to improve the standard of monitoring/scoring. Tidy Britain Group are concerned that one particular Authority may not have been stringent enough with its scoring procedure. As a result Officers have received training on the process to ensure uniformity across the County when working on this indicator.

5.2.3 Street Cleansing Service – 1980 - 2000

Prior to the advent of compulsory competitive tendering Rugby Borough Council operated a very basic level of street cleansing. This service simply consisted of daily town centre early morning cleansing by mechanical methods supported by a ‘barrowman’ who litter picked the town centre throughout the day, Road channels were mechanically swept on a cyclical basis and the footways were de-littered on the same basis.

In the mid 1980's the Council introduced a 'client' section based at the Town Hall to monitor the cleansing and waste services operated by the Works Services Unit, it also produced a specification for street cleansing activities that improved upon the basic levels of service that were being provided at that time. The Local Government Act 1988 introduced Compulsory Competitive Tendering; street cleansing was the first service area to be introduced to this practice. The client produced a formal contract document for this service that included a more robust cleansing specification, the contract was tendered during the early months of 1989 the winning bid (lowest cost) was submitted by the in-house Works Services Unit. The contract commenced in August 1989.

This contract was fraught with problems right from the outset; the Works Services Unit had not calculated the costs of the enhanced specification correctly and had under resourced the service. The Works Services Unit was unable to fulfil the requirements of the contract at a cost effective level. Ultimately the Works Services Unit found itself in a position that it could not make its statutory 5% return on the capital employed on the contract. In early 1991 it decided to withdraw from the contract.

A new contract was drawn up and tendered, and the Works Services Unit tendered but the new contract was awarded to Tyler Waste Management, who submitted the lowest bid. This was significantly higher than the Works Services Unit 1989 tender price. This new contract commenced in June 1991.

Tyler Waste Management’s of street cleansing operations, whilst not without its problems, made some improvements in the overall cleansing of the Borough. However, in the 1990’s Local Government contracts became big business commercially, and many smaller organisations operating contracts for local authorities were being bought out by larger national and multi-national companies. Tyler Waste Management were taken over by AAH Environmental Limited in 1993. This company was a professionally managed organisation that strived to maintain the level of service provided by Tyler Waste Management but it was always looking at ways of increasing its
profitability. The Client had to concentrate far more on its inspection regime in order to ensure that standards were maintained without the Council having to expend needless additional costs.

In 1996/97 AAH Environmental Limited were subject to a Management buy-out and became Serviceteam Limited. This was not a particularly good time for Rugby Borough Council and its street cleansing service. Standards dropped as the company concentrated on increasing profitability, Managers were changed at a local level and this only worsened the situation, at one point during this period the company received so many defaults in one week that it was in breach of contract, it also came very close to Rugby Borough Council actually removing them from the contract.

In 2000 the Council decided to re-let the contract, under Best Value rather than Compulsory Competitive Tendering and the successful tenderer was the Council’s Works Services Unit. At this time the Council had ‘twin hatted’ management of the Refuse and Recycling Service (Client and Contractor); it was a natural progression that the same officers would carry out this dual role for Street Cleansing as well.

**5.2.4 Service Improvements 2000 onwards**

As the Council agreed to operate a ‘soft split’ Client/Contractor relationship with this service it allowed officers to move away from the regularised specification in order to provide continuous improvement of the service. The main elements of the contract were still operating on an input based methodology. However the client/contractor realised that certain elements of the contract required improvement.

**5.2.5 Hit Squad 2002**

Fly-tipping had always been a problem in the borough especially within the rural areas, in 2002 the client/contractor introduced the ‘Hit Squad’, a specialist team within the workforce that would deal with fly-tipping and other urgent cleansing issues, the ‘hit squad’ provided cleansing assistance not only on highway areas but also open spaces and housing areas. The fly-tipping response time is down to 24hrs from report, with many incidents being dealt with immediately.

**5.2.6 Enhanced Cleansing Service 2004**

In 2004 a report was presented to Environment Panel/Cabinet in relation to the overall spend per head of population on the street cleansing service, at the time it transpired that Rugby Borough Council was spending approximately 50% of the national average for non metropolitan borough councils on this service area. Council agreed the following changes to the service based upon this report.

- 2 x Additional Pavement Sweepers each with driver.
- 2 x Additional 2 man litter picking gangs with caged tipper vehicles.
- 1 x Additional large Road Sweeper and driver.
This option furnished the Council with a total of 3 pavement sweepers that provided intense cleansing of all footways throughout the Borough. The two additional litter-picking gangs increased the total number of this type of resource to six. The pavement sweepers and litter-picking gangs provided a minimum service level on any street (either manual picking or mechanical sweeping) of 6 weekly servicing.

The additional large road sweeper assisted significantly in the removal of the silt and detritus build up in channels. This was also one particular area in which the Council was scoring poorly on the BVPI 199 indicator (now NI195b). The second road sweeper provided a minimum service level of six weekly channel cleansing Borough wide compared to the present minimum of twelve weekly.

5.2.7 Graffiti Removal Service 2005

In 2005 the contractor reduced the level of paid overtime on the cleansing service and reduced some operating overheads and with the savings the contractor provided a specialist graffiti removal vehicle. A member of staff was trained to operate the equipment and safely use all the chemicals/solvents necessary to carry out this service. The graffiti removal service continues to provide an important service on the highway and on private properties. This is a service provided by the contractor at no additional cost to the Council, just a reinvestment of savings back into the service.

5.2.8 Rugby BID

The Rugby BID Company came into existence on 1st November 2005. The ‘vision’ of the BID was to make Rugby a cleaner and safer place for residents and visitors alike. Each year a levy will be applied to the Business rates on all businesses within the BID area (roughly the centre of town). As part of the BID promise they have employed a small team of dedicated cleaners to provide a range of specialist cleaning services above and beyond the litter picking and general cleaning provided by this Authority. The BID Company was re-elected in summer of June 2010.

5.2.9 Continuous Service Improvements 2008-Date

Up until 2009 the Council’s cleansing contract specification was ‘input’ based or ‘scheduled’ resulting in many areas of the Borough being cleansed more frequently than was actually necessary to the detriment of other areas that were failing to meet the grade required. In order to rectify this and to achieve better cleansing standards overall a decision was made to change the method of working; moving away from the ‘input’ method of delivering the service to an ‘output’ based methodology that involves directing resources to where there is the greatest need and based on meeting the requirements set out in the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse 2006, précised below.

The Code of Practice provides a practical guide to landowners and occupiers to enable them to discharge duties imposed by the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (section 89/7) to keep specified land clear of litter and refuse, and
on local authorities and the Secretary of State to keep clean public highways for which they are responsible.

5.2.10 Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse 2006

The Code encourages local authorities to maintain their land within acceptable cleanliness standards and outlines cleanliness standards that are graded as follows;

Grade A: Grade B:
No litter, or refuse or detritus; Predominately free of litter; refuse and detritus apart from some small items.

Grade C: Grade D:
Widespread distribution of litter; heavily affected by litter; refuse and/or detritus; refuse and/or detritus with significant minor accumulations.

- **Litter** includes materials often associated with smoking, eating and drinking, that are improperly discarded and left by members of the public; or are spilt during business operations as well as waste management operations. As a guideline a single plastic sack of rubbish should usually be considered fly-tipping rather than litter.

- **Refuse** should be regarded as having its ordinary meaning of waste or rubbish, including household and commercial waste, and can include fly-tipped waste.

- **Detritus** comprises of dust, grit, gravel, stones, rotted leaf and vegetable residues, and fragments of twigs, glass, plastic and other finely broken down materials. Leaf and blossom falls are to be regarded as detritus once they have substantially lost their structure and have become mushy or fragmented.

The Code recognises that a grade A cannot be maintained at all times. It is expected that Councils should keep their land clear of litter, refuse and detritus so that it does not fall below grade B. It should be cleaned to grade A on a regular basis.

The Code classifies the different types of land managed by local authorities into four main zones and councils are required to allocate land into one of these four zones and manage it accordingly;

- **Zone 1, High intensity of use:** Areas which, through intense pedestrian and/or vehicular movements, are prone to fluctuations in litter and refuse and require both high levels of monitoring and frequent cleansing.

- **Zone 2, Medium intensity of use:** Areas affected by moderate levels of pedestrian and vehicular activity thus less prone to fluctuations in litter and refuse, usually situated outside centres of retail or commercial activity, but used regularly by members of the public.
• **Zone 3, Low intensity of use:** Areas subject to low or infrequent levels of pedestrian and vehicular activity as a result less prone to fluctuations in litter and refuse, often located in more rural areas.

• **Zone 4, Areas with special circumstances:** Types of land where issues of health & safety, reasonableness, and practicability are dominant considerations when undertaking environmental maintenance work (includes legislative restrictions for all land types).

To maintain the required standard set out in the Code of Practice 2006 the following guidance is in place:

- **Zone 1** will achieve grade A by 10.00am each day with a mix of mechanical and manual activities. Litter bins are to be output based; they will be emptied to ensure they do not overflow.

- **Zones 2, 3 and 4** will be cleansed according to need as identified by inspections carried out by the Client Monitoring Team and Operational Supervisors, also by request as identified on LEQ (Local Environmental Quality) report forms and other such requests. All works will be placed in an order of priority. The service will provide flexibility in areas where additional works are required.

5.2.11 **Highways**

Highways will be mechanically swept to remove detritus. Sweeping will take place as and when necessary as directed by the Client Monitoring Team, on request from LEQ reporting forms or other such requests for service.

5.2.12 **Roadside verges**

Provision will be made to carry out litter picking of road side verges across the Borough; this will take place as and when necessary as directed by the Client Monitoring Team, on request from LEQ reporting forms or other such requests for service.

5.2.13 **Emptying of Litter and Dog Bins**

This service will be carried out on an output based measure.

5.2.14 **Locality Cleansing Teams**

Locality teams are deployed on a permanent basis to Brownsover Estate, New Bilton and Benn Ward, these teams provide a high level of cleansing in areas that are densely populated and have high levels of footfall. Works include litter picking, fly tipping removal, litter bin emptying, and shop front cleansing.

5.2.15 **Other Service Requirements**

Whilst street cleansing is the key element, there are other ad-hoc service provisions that the Client requires; for example special cleansing prior to or following an event (e.g. Remembrance service) or house clearances.
following instruction from the Environmental Protection Team and Housing these works are carried out as and when required.

5.2.16 Performance Information

The Group considered a comprehensive summary of Performance Indicators which is attached as Appendix 3.

Some variances between the reporting procedures between the Warwickshire districts have been identified, which may account for some of the differences. Officers have undertaken training and authorities would be inspecting each other’s work.

5.3 Grounds Maintenance

5.3.1 Initial Levels of Service

Prior to the advent of Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT) in the late 1980’s Rugby Borough Council provided a very basic level of grounds maintenance service. This service simply consisted of grass cutting on some verges, open space and sports pitches, general sports pitch maintenance and small amounts of bedding works. The one exception to this basic service was the maintenance and improvement of Caldecott Park which like today was the ‘jewel in the borough’s crown’, this park had a team of gardeners almost exclusively responsible for its upkeep.

5.3.2 Compulsory Competitive Tendering

The Council had a team of Officers based at the Town Hall who were responsible for leisure facilities and cemeteries; this team took on the responsibility of the Parks and Grounds Services and became the ‘client’ responsible for the drawing up of the Grounds Maintenance Contracts under the provisions of CCT. The client produced a formal contract document for this service that included a detailed specification, this document significantly improved upon the previous levels of service.

The first contract tendered under CCT was for the Parks and Town area, a high profile element of the Grounds Maintenance Service which included the maintenance of Caldecott Park, Town Gardens and horticultural works in and around the Rugby Town Centre, This work was tendered for a four year period. The winning tender (lowest price) was submitted by Glendale Industries Ltd. This contract commenced in the autumn of 1989. In 1994 the Council let this contract once again for a total of 4 years 3 months and once again Glendale Industries were the successful tenderer, this contract was 20% of the overall Grounds Maintenance service.

In 1997 the Council tendered the remaining 80% of the work and this tender was won by Thames Water Contracting PLC operating as Brophy Limited. This contract was awarded for a total of 6 years and 3 months. In 1998 the Council provide Glendale with a 2 year extension to its 20% contract. In 2000
the Works Services Unit won the 20% tranche from Glendale on a three year contract.

5.3.3 Best Value

In 2003 the Council decided to amalgamate both contracts, the new contract was tendered under ‘Best Value’ and was won back in-house by the Works Services Unit. This service now operates under the Service Level Agreement (SLA) agreed in 2007.

5.3.4 Contract Performance 1989 - 2010

The original contract let in 1989 and operated by Glendale Industries Limited was an unqualified success, so much so that this contractor maintained its grip on the contract until 2000 when it was won back in house by the WSU. Client Officers had an extremely good working relationship with the Contractor and between both parties significant improvements were achieved.

It was during this time that Rugby entered Britain in Bloom with success. This is an area that improves exponentially. Without doubt the success of the results gained in this competition can be attributed to the operational team from Glendale along with the Councils ‘client’ Officers who had the vision that this competition could make a difference to the Town, its residents, businesses and visitors alike. The fact that Rugby gained its greatest success in 2007, when Rugby won silver gilt in its first time in the national finals with the WSU operating as the Contractor proves that the success of the early years with Glendale has not only been maintained but improved upon.

Unfortunately the same cannot be said for the larger 80% tranche contract that was originally won by Brophy Limited. The Council did not have the same working relationship with this particular contractor as it did with Glendale. There were many problems associated with this contract and contractor throughout its 6 years and on a number of occasions the overall level of service provided fell well short of the Councils expectations.

In 2000 the Council decided that it would re-let a combined Grounds Maintenance Contract, under Best Value rather than Compulsory Competitive Tendering, in 2003, the year the 80% tranche was due to end. At this point in time the extension provided to Glendale had ended it was therefore decided to tender this element of work for a 3 year period bringing both contracts into line with each other. The successful tenderer for the 20% tranche was the Councils Works Services Unit. In 2003 the WSU were successful in winning the new Combined Contract. To date the WSU has continued to provide the level of service required under both the contract and the subsequent Service Level Agreement (SLA).

5.3.5 New Working Arrangements
In this service area the client and contractor roles are not operated by the same officers/section as in the case of the Councils Waste/Recycling and Street Cleansing Services, however, since the Borough Council awarded the grounds maintenance contract to the in-house Works Service Unit in 2003 both the ‘client’ and ‘contractor’ have been successfully operating on a partnership basis. Since the introduction of the public realm SLA it has become apparent that to achieve even greater efficiencies and closer working the ‘partnership’ approach had to change into a more robust arrangement. The two service areas (client and contractor) now work as a single team at an operational level.

Working in partnership the Parks (Client) and Grounds (Contractor) Teams have already achieved a significant amount of efficiencies. For example in 2003 when the contract was awarded the parks budget was £1,435,630. Seven years later and despite all the inflation, (on average 3% each year) the budget today stands at £1,263,240, some £172,000 less than 2003 with no effect on the level of service provided. It could even be argued that the standards are actually higher now than in 2003.

In the experience of the Parks Team (Client) these levels of efficiencies and joint working can only be achieved with an in-house service provider, whose service objectives are consistent with the corporate strategic ones. Whilst the private sector does offer closer working arrangements, they come at a cost as their motivation is financially based as opposed to one of service delivery and outcomes.

Therefore the single team approach can only build on the success that the Council has achieved so far and embed the ‘single team’ culture within the service.

Other authorities have also gone down the route of a combined client/contractor unit including Bury, York, Dundee, Leicester, Hinckley and East Devon.

5.3.6 Value for Money

As previously explained the service is currently operating some £172,000 less than 2003. In real terms if the budget had increased 3% year on year this would now stand at £1,765,643 instead of the current £1,263,240. A difference of over £500,000.

Working with industry colleagues Officers have managed to obtain some competitive rates that are currently in use to demonstrate the value for money that the WSU Grounds Team offer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>WSU rate</th>
<th>Contractor A</th>
<th>Contractor B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Grass Cutting</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Digging</td>
<td>134.94</td>
<td>357.52</td>
<td>194.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspect play area</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skilled rates 14.83 29.68 15.00
Unskilled day rates 11.11 n/a 13.00

Whilst it is acknowledged these rates are all subjective to enable the bidders to win contracts, it does give a clear indication on the efficient operation of the service.

5.3.7 Other Examples

The Parks Team investigated a number of different methods of partnerships being carried out nationally. These were

- **Hounslow**
  The London Borough of Hounslow has entered into a partnership arrangement with both a facilities management company undertaking the old ‘client’ function and a grounds maintenance specialist undertaking the ‘contractor’ role. This approach has resulted in a lack of focus, accountability and responsibility, the effect of which is very evident in the standard of the parks and open spaces.

- **Westminster**
  Westminster City Council is trialling a similar approach to Rugby’s proposal of pricing its grounds maintenance work, whereby the work is costed in physical resources such as staff and machinery as an alternative to the traditional ‘job rates’. After one year of operation they have seen service standards improve significantly as resources are targeted where needed at no additional cost.

- **Medway Borough Council**
  Medway are currently experimenting with an integrated management system with the private contractor Quadron. Here the Council remain in full operational control of the workforce, whilst Quadron provide all the resources, including staff and machinery to undertake whatever the ‘client’ wants on fixed asset rates. It is still ‘early days’ for this model, but both parties report the system working well.

5.3.8 National Perspective

The changes introduced to the Parks and Ground service has been somewhat ratified by a recent Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) e-publication, 21st Century Parks. Councillor Brian O’Hare of Knowsley MBC, the Chair of the APSE Parks and Grounds Maintenance Advisory Group Network stated the following in his introduction of the e-publication;

“It is estimated that funding for parks and urban green spaces reduced between 1979 and 2000 by £1.3 billion. This was partly due to the effects of Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT) and because parks is a non-statutory service but whatever the reason it ultimately led to the wasting away of the skills base and a perception that the work was low-skilled, mundane, physical, menial and boring. This trend has now been halted but
The trend of climate change is beginning to impact on parks services and it is likely that this will increase in the coming years.

Against this background there has more recently been a focus on enhancing parks and green spaces through initiatives such as the Green flag scheme. In particular, many bodies are demonstrating how parks link into providing leisure opportunities, as well as environmental and social objectives such as regeneration, neighbourhoods and social inclusion.

Through bodies such as the national lottery significant capital investment has been delivered to many Parks but despite this many local authorities are still struggling to find continued funding to improve parks and maintain them to a good standard in the longer term. However, the greater public priority for investment has enabled local authorities to bring about refurbishment and the renewal of green spaces. The challenge for green space managers in future is to think more imaginatively about both service delivery and sources of funding.

The National Audit Office (NAO) report published in March 2006 on 'enhancing urban green space' highlighted the importance of urban green space in the eyes of the public with 91% believe it is worthwhile spending money in this area. The report also gives an indication in terms of budgets and is a useful tool in outlining the essential nature of performance management especially when it is considered that despite spending almost £700 million on Parks this is only a small fraction of the total £36 billion budget spent by local authorities.

As a result it recommended that more needs to be done to identify the most efficient and effective ways of sustaining green space and that "local authorities should use the reliable data on costs to embed efficiency measures such as APSE Performance Networks in their management of green space".

5.3.9 Service Performance

Not withstanding the Value for Money that the service provides, during 2009 the Service area received:
- 10 comments
- 33 Complaints
- 46 Compliments

Of these, 5 complaints and 15 compliments were directly related to grounds maintenance.

The town retained its Gold status in the Heart of England in Bloom campaign, whilst Caldecott Park gained a Green Flag Award.

5.4.1 Sports Pitches

Rugby Borough Council are responsible for the sports pitches within the town of Rugby and currently provide 3 cricket pitches, 3 senior rugby pitches (including the leased RF2 at Ashlawn)1 Junior Rugby, 13 Senior football, 6 Intermediate, 5 Junior football, 3 mini pitches and 1 Gaelic pitch.
We are also responsible for the grounds maintenance at the Rugby Athletic Track.

Strategically we are currently reviewing the playing pitch strategy which is due to be completed in September 2010. This report will consider the overall grass playing field requirements across the borough for the period up to 2026, with an estimate of need for 2016, 2021 and 2026. It will look at the balance in supply and demand both across the authority as a whole and within the different sub regions of the Borough. It will identify all provision across the borough including borough, parish, schools and private locations.

It will also focus on the planned growth of Rugby town and on determining the needs for the playing field space arising from the planned new housing.

5.4.2 Maintenance

The maintenance works are undertaken by Rugby Borough Councils Grounds Maintenance team, overseen by the head groundsman. The works consist of the weekly maintenance activities, such as grass cutting and marking out to both pre-season and post season maintenance, which includes such tasks as;

- Selective weedkilling
- Fertilising
- Chain harrowing
- Top dressing
- Rolling
- Spiking
- Sanding
- Erection / removal of posts
- Contravating
- Seeding
- Cricket square renovations.

Current and ongoing maintenance programmes will need to be retained in order for the current standard of pitches to be maintained, as any reduction in capital, revenue, staff levels or equipment will lead to poorer quality playing pitches.

5.4.3 Future Improvements

In line with the reviewed play pitch strategy, and the availability of funding, greater investment in priority areas will help to raise the standard of the playing surfaces even further, increase carrying capacity, reduce the amount of games lost during adverse weather and offer more satisfactory and safer pitches for the sports pitch users.

Where the cricket squares offer inconsistent bounce, greater investment would reduce the risk of injury to users and offer better playing facilities.

The condition of the changing pavilions is a cause for concern especially at Alwyn Road and Featherbed Lane Recreation Grounds, where they have a limited life span.
Organisations such as Sport England and The Football Foundation that have traditionally supported funding such improvements are currently having their funding reduced in line with other public bodies. With this combined with the Olympics in 2012 there is little scope for external funding before 2012, although there is renewed optimism that some of the grass roots funding that has been refocused to assist in the delivery of the Olympics Games will be targeted back at helping and supporting a lasting sporting legacy, in line with the expected surge in interest in sport post 2012.

Car parking is an issue at a number of sites, and the surfacing and amount of spaces available could do with improvement if funds are available. However, it must be recognised that for the majority of sites car parking only exceeds existing provision during periods of intense usage for winter sports i.e. Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning, and therefore any increase in capacity should represent value for money and should not reduce the recreational usage of the site significantly (i.e. significant loss of playing surfaces or other recreation).

5.4.4 Quality

It is widely recognised that the playing surfaces across all Rugby Borough Council pitches is generally good, which is also evidenced by absence of any complaints on the playing surface. However, there are some underlying issues of drainage /flooding that will need addressing in the short to medium term to ensure these pitches remain useable. This issue also results in the over use of other pitches which also then generates further inherent problems, and we are currently ‘pushing the boundaries’ of what the current facilities can provide. The review of the playing pitch strategy will take these issues into considerations in its conclusions.

We do however understandably receive complaints on the condition of the pavilions.

5.4.5 Charges

The current fees and charges for the hiring of sports pitches are contained on appendix 1. However the cost of maintaining these pitches is considerably higher than those charged to the clubs. The total cost of maintaining the pitches and providing the games attendants in 2009 was £90,148.62 with an income of £28,659. Broadly speaking therefore the Council subsidise sports pitch provision by some 72%.

The fees and charges are reviewed each year and are also compared against neighbouring authorities, however as the table below demonstrates each authority structures its charges slightly differently making it difficult to compare like for like. Following an increase in 2009 Rugby Borough Council fees are towards the higher end of the charging market.

There are of course many good health, recreation and community reasons why local authorities support such a high level of subsidy for the provision of these facilities which goes back to the original Victorian ethos of the provision of parks and green spaces for the benefit of ‘public health’, and is mirrored in the majority of other local authorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rugby</th>
<th>Coventry</th>
<th>Daventry</th>
<th>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</th>
<th>Nuneaton &amp; Bedworth</th>
<th>Stratford</th>
<th>Warwick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Football</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>36.50~</td>
<td>33.15a</td>
<td>40~</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>45~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>football (non borough teams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Rugby</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Cricket</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>35~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cricket (non borough teams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Gaelic Football</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Football</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Football</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>18.25~~</td>
<td>21.75a</td>
<td>20~</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Football (non borough)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Rugby</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Cricket</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Pitch per season</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>11~</td>
<td>18.65a</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football pitch per season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior cricket per season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Rooms and pitch per season (weekly use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch use only per season (weekly use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing rooms per season junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late Booking Charge: 5.00
Premier Pavilion - Senior: 30.00 inc. in pitch fee
Premier Pavilion - Junior: 15.00
Standard Pavilion - Senior: 25.00
Standard Pavilion - Junior: 12.50
Basic Pavilion - Senior: 20.00
Basic Pavilion - Junior: 10.00
Late Booking Charge: 10.00
Changing Room Hire - one charge
| senior | 20.00 | 25 | 10.00 |
| junior | 10.00 | 5.50 | 6.50 |
| non borough teams |  |  |  |
Changing Rooms and pitch per season
Pitch use only per season (weekly use)
Changing rooms per season junior
Key deposit: 25.00

150% if not from within District
For pitch and changing rooms
weekends only (weekdays £39)
Discount available with block bookings

Other Grounds Maintainence undertaken by the Work Services Unit (WSU)

PARKS

The most well known formal park in Rugby is Caldecott Park which is maintained to a high quality following a 1.5 million pound refurbishment in 2009. This is the most heavily used park which attracts well over a million
visits each year and has successfully gained a nationally recognised Green Flag Award in 2009 and 2010.

However we also maintain some smaller ornamental areas such as Regents Place, The Pleasance and The Percival Guildhouse Garden.

OPEN SPACES

We maintain numerous small incidental pieces of green space throughout the urban area, which are mainly laid down as grass and used for informal recreation opportunities.

RECREATION GROUNDS

Some of the larger open spaces around the urban area are recreation grounds and are home to more formal sporting facilities, although still very popular with local residents for informal activities. Most are also locations for play areas, although have little in the way of landscape quality.

SPORTS FACILITIES

We currently operate the following facilities;
- 3 cricket pitches,
- 3 senior rugby pitches (including the leased RF2 at Ashlawn)
- 1 Junior Rugby
- 13 Senior football,
- 6 Intermediate
- 5 Junior football,
- 3 mini pitches
- 1 Gaelic pitch

We also are responsible for the grounds maintenance at the Rugby Athletic Track. Sports pavilions are provided at Featherbed Lane, Whinfield, Alwyn Road, Freemantle and GEC recreation grounds.

It is widely recognised that whilst the playing surface across all these pitches is generally good the quality of changing facilities does vary quite drastically.

CEMETERIES AND CLOSED CHURCHYARDS

We operate 4 cemeteries at Whinfield, Clifton Road (reopen only), Watts Lane and Croop Hill, along with the responsibility of maintaining 8 closed churchyards, and undertake around 200 burials each year. The Cemetery at Croop Hill has a dedicated Muslim section; Clifton Road is home to the Rugby Greek Orthodox Church whilst Winfield Cemetery has a dedicated Children’s area called the Cloverleaf Memorial Garden.

PLAY AREAS

There are 37 fixed play areas within the Rugby urban area along with 16 facilities for young people. These vary in size, target age and facilities.
sites are designated as Locally Equipped Areas of Play (LEAP's), which provides for people within 5-10 minutes walking distance. The 8 further sites are considered Neighbourhood Equipped Areas of Play (NEAP's), seeking to attract people within 15+ minutes travelling distance.

The 16 facilities for young people, which includes the 8 NEAP's, comprise of various facilities:

- 4 'wheeled sports' facilities
- 6 Multi Use Games Area (MUGA's)
- 4 Half-court games areas
- 2 stand-alone hangout areas
- Outdoor Gym Equipment

Through our qualified playground inspectors all these sites receive a weekly visual inspection and monthly mechanical inspection along with an annual independent safety check.

**ALLOTMENTS**

We manage 6 statutory allotments at Addison Road, Clifton, Eastlands, Freemantle, Newbold, The Kent along with leasing allotments to an association on Ashlawn Road.

**NATURE AREAS**

We manage 5 nature reserves with the assistance of Warwickshire Wildlife Trust and the BTCV. These include, Cock Robin Wood, Great Central Walk, Swift Valley Park, The Bluebell Project and Newbold Quarry Park. Of these 3 are designated local nature reserves and 2 are SINC sites.

5.5 **General Improvements & Other Work Areas**

On top of its core businesses such as refuse, recycling, grounds maintenance and street cleansing the WSU also carries out other services, either in support of its core services or specialist operations for both internal and external clients.

**5.5.1 Public conveniences**

The WSU is responsible, from both a client and service provider perspective, for the cleansing and management of the Councils town centre public convenience situated in North Street.

**5.5.2 Vehicle maintenance workshop**

This service is primarily responsible for the maintenance of the WSU fleet and plant. The fleet now consists of 70 vehicles with some 20 pieces of mechanical plant. The vehicle workshop comprises four qualified mechanics, including the workshop foreman.

**5.5.3 Highways/Civil Engineering Team**
Until 2002, the council operated a highways agency for Warwickshire County Council. The WSU acted as the Council’s main contractor and had as many as 15 operatives working on this service providing highways infrastructure works within the Agency area. The Agency area encompassed the Rugby Town area as well as Clifton, Long Lawford and Dunchurch. The County Council ceased all its agency agreements with the districts in 2002 and the WSU transferred all but three members of its highway team to WCC.

The small highways team that remained in the employ of the WSU has since that time carried out various highways and civil works for the Council and external customers, as well as a number of miscellaneous duties in support of the WSU’s core activities. The following is an example of the types of works carried out by the WSU highways team:

- Highway/Drainage construction schemes for RBC.
- Street furniture installation and repair.
- Removal of bulky fly tips with the grab truck.
- Private car crossings (on WCC approved list of contractors)
- Works for Parish Councils (footways, car parks and lay-bys etc)
- Private and RBC winter gritting.
- Private works (driveways, block paving etc)
- Fencing
- White Lining
- Environment Agency Contractor for brook clearance.
- Environment Agency emergency call out.
- General land drainage works.

5.5.4 Commercial Waste Collection Service

Since 1991, the WSU has successfully operated an independent commercial waste collection service which to date has just over 1000 customers spread throughout the borough.

5.6 External Income

The WSU already provides chargeable services to both the domestic and commercial sectors of the Borough, these main two areas are;

- Commercial Waste Collection Service
  The Council already offers a Commercial Waste Collection service to all businesses within the Borough and has in excess of 1000 customers. The WSU also provides a very small scale commercial recycling service to around 80 of its customers.

- Highways/Civil Engineering
  The WSU operates a small team responsible for minor civil engineering works; this team acts as the main contractor for the Public Realm Team. In order to sustain the service the team also carry out work for a number of Parish Councils carrying out local improvement schemes such as footways and car parks as well as providing drop kerbs and driveways for householders.
5.6.1 Income Generation Opportunities

- Refuse, Recycling and Green Waste Collection Service

  The obvious expansion for this service would be in the area of commercial recycling, including food-waste collections from restaurants, consideration could also be given to a separate industrial waste collection service.

- Vehicle Workshop

  The vehicle workshop could expand its services to include a MOT Testing Station and also vehicle servicing. All necessary Council Taxi tests could be carried out together with annual MOT tests.

- Highways/Civil Engineering/Handyman Service

  As previously mentioned the Highways/Civil Engineering section already carries out ‘private’ works to a number of external clients, however there is possibility of further expansion in the following areas:-

- Grounds Maintenance Service

  Works offered could range from basic garden tidy-ups to full scale landscaping/garden design.

- Street Cleansing

  The Council can provide mechanical cleansing services to developers and contractors carrying out building/construction works.

- Driver Training
- Vehicle Advertising

5.6.2 Charging Structures

If the Council wishes to move forward in pursuing these external income opportunities it has to consider whether it wants to charge or trade.

There is a fundamental distinction between charging for a discretionary service and commercial trading. The purpose of charging for discretionary services is to allow local authorities to perform those services and to recover the costs of so doing. By contrast, commercial trading is risk based trading in the private sector.

5.7 Public Involvement, Civic Pride

Members considered potential ways of encouraging people to get involved in their area and thus promote a sense of civic pride.

Results from the latest place survey indicated that people generally felt a high level of satisfaction with the open spaces and facilities within the Borough.
Almost three fifths (59%) of respondents believe a great deal or to some extent that the local public services are working to make the area safer. Over two fifths (42%) stated not very much or not at all.

Almost two thirds (64%) of respondents believe a great deal or to some extent that the local public services are working to make the area cleaner and greener. Slightly over one third (36%) stated not very much or not at all.

**Satisfaction with Public Services**

- Almost three fifths (59%) of residents feel satisfied that Rugby Borough Council keeps the District clear of litter and refuse.
- Almost nine out of ten (87%) residents feel satisfied with the refuse collection provided by Rugby BC.
- Almost three quarters (73%) of residents feel satisfied with the doorstep recycling provided by Rugby BC.
- Three quarters (75%) of residents feel satisfied with the local tips / household waste recycling centres.
- Over two fifths (42%) of residents feel satisfied with the sports/leisure facilities provided by Rugby BC.
- Two thirds (66%) of residents feel satisfied with the parks and open spaces provided by Rugby BC.

The Group were advised of several activities to try to encourage participation and involvement in the local area. These include

- Rugby in Bloom campaign
  - School children planting trees and bulbs.
  - Allotment holders planting community orchards
  - Local people organising litter picks
  - Rugby BID visiting every shop in the town centre asking for sponsorship for the campaign.
  - Volunteers judging the garden competition
  - Many of the business and industrial entries are done by people in their own time.
- Friends of Groups
- Support and involvement with school groups.

Members considered some ways of encouraging more community involvement but felt that a separate review was required to look at the options in detail.

**5.8 Visit to Sevenoaks District Council**

Sevenoaks DC had been judged an excellent authority with an in-house WSU. The Chairman of the Task Group and officers visited and met Sevenoaks DC officers.

The district is slightly larger and has 3 towns. The operations carried out by the WSU were very similar to Rugby’s WSU. There is no distinction between the client and contractor function.

There were some additional strands of income, as Sevenoaks charges for garden waste service, a commercial recycling service, community minibus
service, pest control, cesspit emptying and offers a public MOT service at its garage workshop.

Levels of performance seem similar, or are exceeded by Rugby but the significant difference is that Sevenoaks DC WSU has the ability to offer a wide range of external services, thereby generating additional income.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The Panel has drawn the following conclusions from its review:

6.1 Refuse and Recycling

- The step change to the new refuse and recycling system has been a great improvement in the service offered.
- The waste management survey provided a lot of useful responses and gave a good indication of the areas that need improvement.
- Members felt that there were gaps in the response to the waste survey and felt more should be done to reach family groups, the rented sector, hard to reach groups and mixed communities.
- There may be more scope for offering a commercial recycling service; although the current service is limited any future expansion would need to be self funding.

6.2 Street Cleansing

- The importance of Rugby BID was noted and if they are not re elected in the future then town centre cleanliness standards would suffer unless the council could find additional funding needed to maintain the same standards.
- There are problems with litter accumulations on private ground, which may often be perceived as the responsibility of the Council, but is not. Owners of private land, particularly developers need to be made aware of their responsibilities.
- It is important that members of the public report any areas where there are problems with litter and graffiti so they can be responded to and help meet targets.
- Some rural areas have no kerb edge and it is therefore difficult to sweep without disturbing the grass verges. They are not inspected as they are difficult to sweep and would automatically result in a fail. This situation has been referred to DEFRA.
- Fly tipping indictors only measure how many incidents occur, but not how quick the response was.
6.3 Grounds Maintenance

- A system of evaluation needs to be developed, preferably one that does not rely on Performance Indicators that are based on the number of times an action is carried out i.e. the number of times that grass is cut. This could be in the form of setting pictorial performance standards.

- Having workers trained in more than one aspect of the work of the unit creates a more flexible skill base. Even so the works undertaken need to be considered at a corporate level, resources are allocated to achieve the corporate strategy and priorities. Sometimes it is not possible to take on additional works without requiring additional resources.

- Allowing members of staff on the ground to determine whether works need to be carried out will allow for a better and more flexible use of resources.

- The budget available for grounds maintenance had effectively been reduced over time and higher standards were being achieved.

6.3.1 Sports Pitches

An investigation should be made into setting up a charging system to allow for charging of training sessions.

6.4 General Improvements & Other Work Areas

- There may be potential income generation possibilities in the vehicle workshop and the commercial recycling fields.

- Having an in house service provider gives advantages of flexibility. Changes can be made to service provision details and penalties for contract changes avoided.

6.5 External Income

- The issue of charging or trading was a major issue. To be able to trade the Council would need to become a limited company. It was felt that the Works Services Unit is too large to do this in the near future. It would be possible to breakaway small parts of the service. Areas suggested for this included:
  - Highways/Civil Engineering/Handyman Service
  - Vehicle Workshop
  - Commercial Waste/Recycling Collection
  - Members agreed in principle to expand the vehicle workshop to provide vehicle servicing and an MOT station but raised concerns that this would
have a negative impact on local businesses. It was noted that many authorities offer MOT work.

6.6 Public Involvement, Civic Pride

- There should be a further review to consider how to encourage more involvement from the public in using and looking after open spaces and facilities.

6.7 Evaluation of Choices: Whether to Keep the WSU In-House or Put it Out to Tender

- Members endorse the Work of the WSU and seek to keep the services that it provides in house.

- The review group considered that the performance in all areas of the unit provided value for money, with services that are performing well. It did not wish to see levels of service provided reduced in any way.

- In order to secure the future of the unit, members considered that all opportunities for taking on chargeable work were exploited. They note that the unit do not feel ready to create a trading arm; however should there be a future opportunity to create income in this way it would be endorsed provided it was accompanied by a market analysis and business plan.
Public Realm – Draft Action Plan

Recommendations approved by Cabinet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assigned to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Date complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officers from the unit should work together with legal and financial officers to expand the services that can be offered on a “charged for” basis. These should include:

- Expansion of garage to allow MOTs to be carried out
- Providing Handyman Services
- Expand the commercial recycling service.
Future expansion of services be encouraged, providing a market analysis and a business case have been prepared.

The review group endorse any future plans to set up a company for any part of the unit where it would consider it beneficial to have full powers to trade.

Developers should be contacted and informed of their legal responsibilities in clearing litter from development sites. Farmers and Farm contractors should also be reminded of their responsibilities to keep highways clear of debris.

Consideration should be given to future street cleansing contracts with a view to reducing levels of detritus in rural areas.

There needs to be a system of education to inform the public that the cleansing of all open spaces is not the responsibility of the Council if the land is private.

All parish councils should be given environmental action forms on an annual basis.

Provide greater education on the problem of litter rather than using enforcement as a solution to littering. A anti litter campaign could be useful in targeting the issue of educating the public.

There is a need to be more pro active and to encourage the public to report littered areas.

Consideration be given to introducing some street bins for recyclables.
| Performance Indicators be developed for grounds maintenance, based on visual presentation of the green spaces. Members of the public could be recruited as champions to report on these standards. Supporting aims could be to improve the number of green flag awards held and improved ratings in Heart of England in Bloom, Greenstat returns and peer reviews from other authorities. |
| WSU consider expanding the vehicle workshop to undertake private commercial work to boost income generation. |
| The commercial recycling charging be re evaluated to develop potential for expansion of the service and boost income generation. |
| A separate review proposal on encouraging community involvement be submitted to the scrutiny workshop 2011. |