



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

A Borough to be proud of

FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND DECISION MAKING

SCRUTINY COMMISSION

11 MAY 2017

WARDS AFFECTED: ALL WARDS

SCRUTINY REVIEW: REFUSE & RECYCLING

Report of the Director (Corporate Services)

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To review the provision of refuse and recycling services.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Scrutiny Commission reviews the service.

3. BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

3.1 The Scrutiny Commission has requested to undertake a review of refuse & recycling services to ensure value for money and a high level of service provision.

3.2 This is a scrutiny review and the Scrutiny Commission is encouraged to make any recommendations it sees fit. These recommendations may be to officers, the Executive or Council as appropriate.

3.3 The attached report prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited provides benchmarking information which can be used to support the review, although this report was prepared for the purpose of determining the future of the recycling service which is a separate matter to this review.

3.4 Refuse collection was outsourced in 1989 and brought back in house in 2003 following excessive complaints, concerns about the condition of the fleet and reports of low staff morale.

3.5 The dry recycling service was outsourced in 2003 and is currently run by Palm Recycling, sub-contracted to Wards.

3.6 Pages 9 and 10 of the attached report provide current benchmarking information for waste collection and highlight the following:

- “Across the East Midlands, the Council had the fifth lowest cost of waste collection (based on CIPFA figures)”
 - “For the APSE benchmarking group HBBC’s net cost of refuse collection is significantly lower than the average (around 60%) and around 64% of the average cost for recycling collections. Indeed for refuse collection costs HBBC is second out of 15 and for recycling costs third out of 11”
 - “Based on APSE data, HBBC’s labour and transport costs are below average for its benchmarking ‘family’ group”
 - “Comparing waste collection driver and loader costs in Leicestershire, the Council’s driver costs are slightly below average and the loaders slightly above average”
 - “Comparing costs of service delivery to the size of authority (based on household numbers), the analysis indicated that HBBC’s service was one of the lowest cost for its size. In addition, it was shown to have a lower costs than a broadly comparable outsourced service”.
- 3.7 The report highlights concerns such as the limited capacity for additional work of the waste collection crews which is a particular concern in light of housing growth.
- 3.8 The following operational issues are raised in the report:
- In 2015/16 the waste collection service missed, on average, 40 collections per 100,000 scheduled collections compared to top quartile performance (APSE) of 25
 - HBBC’s sickness levels are comparatively low – 2.90% of working time lost to sickness in the waste collection service, compared to 18% for the highest APSE comparator
 - In comparison to other services within HBBC, sickness absence was 8.78 days per employee in Streetscene Services, compared with an authority average of 7.59 days
 - The average age for the frontline waste collection workforce is increasing and is currently 44 for HBBC. This may lead to increased absence levels and future pressures on the authority.
- 3.9 Customer satisfaction with waste collection is higher than the four other East Midlands authorities sampled in the report at 91.2%.
- 3.10 Page 10 of the report shows that HBBC was in the top quartile for cost of collection for the performance generated, meaning the cost per household was low for the high levels of recycling achieved.
- 3.11 The report goes on to outline other options for waste collection models (including method and frequency of collection) and to analyse those (page 12 onwards). It also considers options for the future of the service and recommends insourcing the recycling service based on the well managed and value for money provided currently in relation to residual and garden waste collection services. It is suggested that providing all three services in house will further improve operational efficiency.
- 3.12 Since 2010, the council has also been operating a commercial waste service – both residual waste and recycling. Section 7 of the report (page 22 onwards) refers to this service.
- 3.13 The conclusions on page 24 of the report support the valuable services provided by HBBC and highlight the value for money of the current household waste collection

service and the healthy financial position of the commercial waste service and scope to expand this.

4. EXEMPTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ACCESS TO INFORMATION PROCEDURE RULES

4.1 This report is to be taken in public session.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (IB)

5.1 Financial implications are detailed in the attached report from Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure UK. Any recommendations that are to be implemented as a result of the Amec report will require approval in accordance with financial procedure rules.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS (AR)

6.1 As set out within the body of this report the Council presently outsources the dry recycling to Palm Recycling. The contract that governs this arrangement will need to be assessed and the termination provisions abided prior to the Council seeking an alternative provider or such services being provided in-house.

6.2 Any further outsourcing of work may give rise to procurement implications and such rules will need to be assessed and abided by prior to any other provider being appointed.

7. CORPORATE PLAN IMPLICATIONS

7.1 This supports the ambition of creating clean and attractive places to live and work by keeping our borough clean and green.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 No external consultation has been undertaken at this stage.

9. RISK IMPLICATIONS

9.1 It is the Council's policy to proactively identify and manage significant risks which may prevent delivery of business objectives.

9.2 It is not possible to eliminate or manage all risks all of the time and risks will remain which have not been identified. However, it is the officer's opinion based on the information available, that the significant risks associated with this decision / project have been identified, assessed and that controls are in place to manage them effectively.

9.3 This is a scrutiny review and no decision is to be made, therefore there are no risks associated.

10. KNOWING YOUR COMMUNITY – EQUALITY AND RURAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 This review supports all communities, areas, parishes and groups in the borough by ensuring value for money and high performance.

11. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

11.1 By submitting this report, the report author has taken the following into account:

- Community Safety implications
- Environmental implications
- ICT implications
- Asset Management implications
- Procurement implications
- Human Resources implications
- Planning implications
- Data Protection implications
- Voluntary Sector

Background papers: Refuse and Recycling Review report by Amec Foster Wheeler
Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited

Contact Officer: Rebecca Owen, ext 5879
Executive Member: Councillor Mark Nickerson