

## ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member and Advisers for Waste and Emergency Planning</b>
2.	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Monday 4<sup>th</sup> November 2013</b>
3.	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Review of Street Cleansing Target Response Times</b>
4.	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Environment and Development Services</b>

### 5. Summary

Reductions to Street Cleansing resources have prompted a review of current Street Cleansing response times as there are concerns that existing targets in specific areas of reactive work are no longer sustainable. This report outlines the impact of resource reductions on performance and proposals for revised targets.

### 6. Recommendations

Cabinet Member approves the proposed revised service standard response times as set out below under Proposals and Details

## 7. Proposals and Details

### Review of Standards and Targets

Significant Street Cleansing budget reductions from 2011-12 through to the current financial year continue to impact on resources and service capacity. The service reviewed its routine operational practices and implemented revised schedules from April 2012 and a review of current reactive operational standards targets has now been completed and has concluded that a number are no longer sustainable with the reduced levels of resources.

### Benchmarking

A bench-marking exercise was also completed to gauge the extent to which Rotherham's current and proposed targets compare with the Council's 'family group' of local authorities and also the extent to which the current financial challenges are prompting similar reviews elsewhere. .

This exercise focused on a sample of 16 of Rotherham's 'comparator' authorities as identified by the CIPFA '*Nearest Statistical Neighbours*' model or the APSE Performance Networks model (see Appendix 1).

Overall this survey concluded there is no standard pattern emerging in terms of reductions to street cleansing services and delivery targets which perhaps reflects variations in local spending priorities. A clear fact which did emerge is that Rotherham's Street Cleansing standards are more target-driven than the majority of comparator councils therefore, regardless of the proposed target adjustments, Rotherham will continue to aim to deliver a relatively higher quality service.

### Proposals

The following table sets out the proposed changes to Rotherham's Street Cleansing targets, the rationale for these changes and the results of the benchmarking exercise.

**Street Cleansing Targets - Performance 10/11 - 12/13, Proposed Revisions and Benchmarking.**

Current Service Standard	Target	Cumulative Performance			Proposed Changes	Rationale	Benchmarking
		10/11	11/12	12/13			
Attend reported incidents of Fly-Tipping within 4 working days (Note: <i>This reflects the published target but the service has an internal 'stretch' target to attend within 1 working day.</i> )	90%	96%	89.7%	79%	Cease the operational 'stretch' target to attend within 1 working day and amend published target to <b>2 working days.</b> Monitor and report against the new 2 day target	<p>12/13 performance was below target. This was consistent with the direction of travel at the close of 2011/12 compared with 2010-11. Cumulative performance for 13/14 performance is currently 61%.</p> <p>The number of fly tipping reports actually decreased from 2,394 in 2010-11 to 2,311 in 2012-13 - a fall of around 3%. Removal of fly tipping is delivered by an integrated service responding to a range of street cleansing issues. Reduced capacity has led to less flexibility in resource allocation and prioritisation. Performance is particularly vulnerable during severe cold weather when resources are diverted to winter maintenance work.</p>	57% of the authorities who responded aimed to remove fly tipping within 2 or 3 days and in one case 5 days. The remainder aimed to remove it within one day. Two of the councils responding focused their attention on urgent removal of hazardous fly tipped waste with non hazardous waste removed either as part of scheduled work or as and when the resource was available.
Removal of racist / offensive graffiti – standard: 90% in 1 day.	90%	98.9%	92.8%	78%	No changes proposed, extending the target times for non offensive graffiti and other standards will allow the service to better meet this target	<p>2012-13 cumulative performance was below the target. This trend has continued into 13/14 with current cumulative performance around 54%.</p> <p>Resource reductions and temporary reallocation due to severe winter weather have impacted on the capacity of the service to meet targets</p> <p>There has also been some increase in reports. The 164 reports during 12/13 represented a 12% increase over the 146 reported during 10/11.</p>	There is a consistent approach to racist and offensive graffiti which is generally removed within 24 hours of notification.

**Street Cleansing Targets - Performance 10/11 - 12/13, Proposed Revisions and Benchmarking.**

Current Service Standard	Target	Cumulative Performance			Proposed Changes	Rationale	Benchmarking
		10/11	11/12	12/13			
Remove reported Non Offensive Graffiti within 4 working days	90%	92.2%	92.1%	69%	Response time extended to 5 working days	<p>2012-13 cumulative performance was below the target. Current cumulative performance for 13/14 is 53%.</p> <p>As above resource reductions and temporary reallocations due to severe winter weather have impacted on performance. There has also been a significant increase in customer reports. The 331 reports during 12/13 amounted to an almost 40% increase over the 223 reported for 10/11. This rise can in some way be contributed to the reduction in resource and resultant reduced capacity to carry out proactive works (i.e. removing before a report is received)</p>	The approach with regards 'non offensive' graffiti is mixed. 59% (10) of surveyed authorities sought to remove it within 3 - 5 days. One authority reported no longer having a standard for non offensive graffiti following severe budget cuts. A small number reported seeking to remove it whenever possible but this sometimes takes weeks.
Empty reported overflowing litter bins within 1 working day	90%	100%	N/A	N/A (See comments under 'Rationale')	No change proposed but we will ensure reporting of all contacts and response times to inform future service planning.	The revised schedules following 10/11 created some uncertainty with regards reporting against this standard in particular where an overflowing litter bin was in any event scheduled to be emptied within one or two days after a customer notification. It is however proposed to retain this standard and officers have been instructed to report all customer notifications of overflowing bins and our subsequent responses times. This will enable accurate monitoring of the situation with a view, if necessary, to reviewing performance at current resource levels and identifying achievable targets.	61% of councils aimed to deal with reports of overflowing bins on more than 1 day, A number admitted that they did not keep a record of performance and did not use this as a service standard. 24% (4) generally emptied bins in accordance with schedules regardless of customer notifications and 29% (5) did not use this as a standard at all. One council has installed larger bins in areas of heavy use but also removed those it no longer has the resource to service.

**Street Cleansing Targets - Performance 10/11 - 12/13, Proposed Revisions and Benchmarking.**

Current Service Standard	Target	Cumulative Performance			Proposed Changes	Rationale	Benchmarking
		10/11	11/12	12/13			
Removal of Dog Mess – standard: 90% removed in 1 day.	90%	96.5%	88.4%	79%	Change the standard definition to remove 90% within 1 day <i>from identified priority locations (e.g. child play areas)</i> . In non priority locations the response time will be as for litter (5 days)	Cumulative performance was below target in 2011-12 and 2012-13. This was against a background of increased service request volumes from 499 in 2010-11 to 790 in 2012-13. This was an increase of 58% and indicates the vulnerability of performance against the current target with reduced resource levels. Current cumulative performance for 13/14 is 88%.	Councils responding on this issue generally aimed to attend reports within 1 working. None reported setting a target to deal with a set percentage within a specific time. One council was however able to report achieving 83% within 1 working day. Some councils classed dog mess as general litter.
Removal of litter – standard: 90% in 5 days.	90%	96.6%	97.9%	94%	No Change	Cumulative performance was above target for 2012-13 Current cumulative performance for 13/14 is 97%. Above target performance has been sustained despite the increased volume of service requests which grew from 610 in 2010-11 to 776 in 2012-13 - an increase of 27%.	Response times generally within 4 - 5 days but other Councils tend not to not set targets to deal with a specific percentage in a set time.  <b>Note:</b> The Environmental Protection Act does not set a single standard response time for litter clearance.
Clear up spillage on Highway with 4 hours of notification	90%	100%	100%	95%	No Change. Service requests against this standard must always take priority due to safety concerns.	Service request volumes are relatively low compared with fly tipping or graffiti but did actually increase by around 44% between 2010-11 and 2012-13 from 66 to 92.	Service requests tend to be prioritised due the safety concerns. Response times are generally 100% within 4 hours

## Town Centre Standards

This report is concerned with borough wide standards and targets only. A separate report detailing proposed changes to town centre operations will be presented in early in the New Year.

### **8. Finance**

This report is intended to address the ongoing outcomes of a reduction in financial resource

### **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

Streetpride's overall efficiency in meeting its target response times can be adversely affected by factors beyond Streetpride's control, such as extreme weather conditions.

### **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The Streetpride service deals with local environmental and street scene issues and makes an important contribution to the Council's corporate priorities for clean streets.

### **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Streetpride response times reports 2010 -11, 2001-12 and 2012-13

#### **Contact Names:**

*Steve Hallsworth Leisure and Community Services Manager Streetpride, . Ext 22483 email: [Steve.hallsworth@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Steve.hallsworth@rotherham.gov.uk).*

## **Appendix 1.**

### **Benchmarking of Comparator Authority Street Cleansing Standards and Targets**

A benchmarking exercise has been undertaken to ascertain the extent to which other local authorities are adjusting street cleansing standards and targets during the current period of budget and resource reduction.

The survey focused on a sample 'comparator' authorities as defined by the Audit Commission / CIPFA 'Nearest Statistical Neighbours' model and the APSE Performance Networks model.

#### **CIPFA / Audit Commission Nearest Statistical Neighbours Model:**

This model generates 'family groups' based on a range of socio-economic indicators. This model identifies the following as Rotherham's nearest statistical neighbours:

#### **APSE Performance Networks Model**

This model is restricted to those authorities who choose to participate in the APSE Performance Networks service for Street Cleansing. It places more weight on service profile characteristics such as scope of cleansing operations, service standards and human resources issues and therefore can identify some surprising comparators (e.g. Shetland Isles).

The following table lists those comparator authorities from whom we able to gather information,

<b>Authority</b>	<b>Comparator Group</b>
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	CIPFA
Bassetlaw District Council	APSE
Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council	CIPFA
Borough of Telford and Wrekin	CIPFA
Darlington Borough Council	APSE
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	CIPFA
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council	CIPFA
Dudley Metropolitan Council	APSE
Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council	CIPFA
Halton Borough Council	CIPFA
Renfrewshire Council	APSE
St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council	CIPFA
Stirling Council	APSE
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	CIPFA
Telford Council	APSE
West Lothian Council	APSE