

Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Date: 16 October 2013

Agenda item: 8

Wards: All

Subject: Outcome of Public value Review of Street Cleansing

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment and Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Judy Saunders

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact officer: Cormac Stokes, Head of Street Scene and Waste

Recommendations:

A. The Panel notes and considers the outcomes of the Public Value Review

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. This report sets out the details of the Public Value Review (PVR) of Street Cleansing together with the proposed implementation plan.

2 DETAILS

2.1. The PVR of Street Cleansing Service was scheduled to be undertaken between October 2012 and March 2013 and was part of a tranche of pilot reviews also covering Merton Adult Education Services and Communications.

2.2. The PVR was undertaken following a period of sustained improvements in street cleansing. The table below sets out the standards of cleanliness as measured by independent inspections. The figures indicate the number of streets/areas where there was an unacceptable level of litter/detritus.

	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013 YTD
Litter	21%	14.50%	6%	5.90%	7.97%	5.70%
Detritus	51%	39%	9.47%	6.90%	11.80%	5.50%

2.3. Resident satisfaction with street cleaning has remained consistent since 2009 as shown in the table below.



2.4. The above improvements have been delivered through a more targeted approach to street cleaning requirements and a slow shifting away from an input-based to a more intelligence-led approach.

2.5. Following the completion of the PVR of the Street Cleansing service a report has been prepared and is attached Appendix 1.

2.6. The PVR was given a clear mandate: “to improve resident satisfaction with the service.” The approach to the review was agreed with a small working group of members of the Scrutiny Panel.

2.7. The key lines of enquiry for the review were:

- making best use of our existing staff,
- establishing the right Street Cleansing approach for Merton,
- exploring new ways of working,
- how to improve residents’ perception of the service and,
- exploiting potential synergies between departments.

2.8. In order to ensure that the focus remained on delivering better outcomes for residents a resident survey was carried out by an external provider. The main purpose of the survey was to understand the key priorities of residents with respect to the range of street cleansing functions and services.

2.9. The review demonstrated the potential to redesign the service within existing resources to more closely address the key resident concerns of litter and fly tipping.

2.10. The Public Value Review identified a number of recommendations which were:

- To redesign the service to address the needs of each location, to deliver a consistent level of cleanliness across the borough;
- To review the management structure of the service to deliver reduced spans of control and clear line management responsibilities to improve performance and significantly reduce sickness levels;
- To implement a robust, evidenced approach to managing and benchmarking staff productivity;
- To realise a shift in the contact channels into the service through development of fully automated e-forms for online reporting;
- To explore options for implementation of mobile working within the department for Response Teams and frontline supervisory posts;
- To review branding to raise the profile of the service and its staff;
- To explore the development of the Garth Road site through the Asset Management Strategy, to improve facilities, maximise capacity and identify the potential to realise a capital receipts / revenue income from land made available.

2.11. An implementation Plan has been developed addressing the key recommendations arising from the report and this is attached as appendix 2.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

3.1. The key alternative option would be to do nothing as a result of the PVR and continue to deliver the service in its current form. However, this would not address the key areas of priorities identified by the residents survey nor would it deliver any ongoing savings.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

4.1. In addition to the resident survey referred to above, officers involved in the PVR also consulted with the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (September 2012), front line staff and representatives of a key private sector supplier.

5 TIMETABLE

5.1. The timetable for implementation is set out in the implementation plan attached as Appendix 2.

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. Contained within attached report

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1. None applicable to this report

- 8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS**
- 8.1. Contained within report
- 9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**
- 9.1. Contained within report
- 10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**
- 10.1. Contained within report
- 11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT**
- Appendix 1: Final Report: Public Value Review of Street Cleansing
 - Appendix 2: Implementation Plan
- 12 BACKGROUND PAPERS**
- 12.1. None