

**Chichester District Council**

**Efficiency Review of Chichester**

**Contract Services – Concise Report**

**Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds**

**Maintenance**

**January 2017**

The Pavilion, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Botleigh Grange Office Campus, Hedge End, Southampton, Hampshire, SO30 2AF

Tel: 02382 022800

Email: [waste.enquiries@wyg.com](mailto:waste.enquiries@wyg.com)



## Document Control

Project: Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance  
Client: Chichester District Council  
Job Number: A099696  
File Origin: Projects\Chichester DC (08314)\A099696 (Efficiency Review)\Reports

### Document Checking:

Prepared by:	Len Attrill, Matt Sellwood, Joanne O'Sullivan	Signed:	 <i>M. Sellwood</i> <i>J. O'Sullivan</i>
--------------	--	---------	--

Checked by:	Len Attrill	Signed:	
-------------	-------------	---------	--

Verified by:	Matt Sellwood	Signed:	 <i>M. Sellwood</i>
--------------	---------------	---------	------------------------

Issue	Date	Status
1	November 2016	Final draft
2	November 2016	Final
3	December 2016	Concise Report
4	January 2017	Concise Report v2



**Contents Page**

1.0	Introduction & Background.....	3
2.0	Performance – Waste and Recycling.....	8
3.0	Performance – Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance.....	16
4.0	Value for Money.....	19
5.0	Looking Forward.....	22



### 1.0 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.0.1 Chichester District Council (CDC) is a waste collection authority and serves a population of 115,500 people in approximately 55,140 households. The Council's in-house direct services organisation, Chichester Contract Services (CCS), delivers many of the Council's front-line services including recycling and residual waste collections from both domestic properties and commercial businesses; street cleansing; grounds maintenance; workshop and MOTs; the public convenience service and the cemetery service.

1.0.2 A contract for Waste Collection, Recycling and Street Cleansing was let in 2002 for 6 years with an option to extend for a further four years. This was further extended by Cabinet to 2015 at which time the decision was to continue with the in-house service. The grounds maintenance contract was originally let in 1995 and is currently delivered by the council and some private contractors.

1.0.3 The Council is currently undertaking an Improvement Programme aimed at modernising the in-house service.

1.0.4 Alongside this Improvement Programme, the Council believes that a review with a wider remit would be beneficial. As such WYG has been engaged to carry out the following:

- to provide a high level assessment of the waste collection service, the streets cleansing service and the grounds maintenance service (to the extent of the service currently provided by CCS) and to advise whether the services are operating efficiently and effectively and represent good value for money.
- to review the waste collection service, street cleansing service and grounds maintenance service and to advise whether the services could be delivered more efficiently and effectively and at lower cost by an alternative service provider.

### 1.1 Background to Services

1.1.1 The waste collection system currently used by CDC is as follows:

- Alternate weekly collection of residual waste from a wheeled-bin and dry mixed recyclables (DMR) from wheeled-bins collecting paper, card, mixed glass, steel and aluminium cans, plastic bottles, plastic pots, tubs and trays, juice cartons and aerosols;



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

- Bins for waste and recycling are purchased by the resident, or, in the case of communal properties, by the residents association or management company;
  - Where wheeled-bins cannot be stored, residual waste is collected from plastic sacks;
  - There are some properties serviced by communal bins; and
  - Garden waste collected fortnightly from a 240-litre wheeled bin on a chargeable basis.
- 1.1.2 To reduce residual waste and encourage recycling, CDC has a number of policies on excess waste, whereby excess residual waste should not be collected. Residents are permitted to present excess waste beside their wheeled-bin if the waste is contained within a pre-purchased Council sack. In addition, the Council requires that bins are not overfilled and the lid should be closed.
- 1.1.3 The chargeable service for garden waste currently costs £49 per household per annum and as at the end of December 2016 there were 12,950 customers.
- 1.1.4 Bulky waste is also collected on a chargeable basis, at a rate of £20 for the first item and £15 for each additional item up to eight in total.
- 1.1.5 There is a Commercial Waste operation. It is worth stating that under the EPA (Environmental Protection Act) Waste Collection Authorities have a duty to 'arrange' for Commercial Waste to be collected if requested: but many councils do not directly provide a Commercial Waste service. Further, if a council chooses to provide a Commercial waste service (as CDC does) then there is no obligation for commercial premises in the Collection Authority to use it: and it is only the most successful, well-organised operations which have a sizeable customer base and which operate at a surplus, contributing to Council finances and offsetting household waste costs.
- 1.1.6 All collected materials are delivered to facilities provided by the disposal authority, West Sussex County Council (WSSC). The WSSC MRF (Materials Recycling Facility - operated by Viridor) processes a wide range of dry recyclables as described above.
- 1.1.7 Street cleansing is carried out at a variety of locations within the District. Functions include the sweeping and litter-picking of streets (including the city centre, various town centres, residential streets and industrial areas) and the litter-picking of footpaths and beaches.



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

There is also a responsibility for the provision and emptying of litterbins and dog waste bins; and for the removal of abandoned vehicles, fly-tips, graffiti and flyposting. A particular challenge is the cleansing of the A27 trunk road, which for much of its length within the District is a high-speed dual carriageway with a small central reservation: this requires special (expensive) measures to cleanse.

- 1.1.8 Some of the grounds maintenance functions are currently outsourced but the Council retains the function of developing and managing such functions. Many of the grounds maintenance services are delivered in-house including at a number of high quality horticultural locations and this includes some of the more highly-skilled operations such as fine turf and high quality floral bedding.

### **1.2 Focus of this Report**

- 1.2.1 The primary focus of this report is to review costs and performance for the current services of waste collection, street cleansing and grounds maintenance: additionally, we will be reviewing options for the Council in terms of improving its recycling / composting performance.
- 1.2.2 We were asked specifically to look at the option of introducing a weekly food waste collection; either as an entirely separate collection using a dedicated fleet or collected at the same time as dry recyclables and/or residual waste via the same vehicle with a separate compartment or pod. With such an option there would need to be a change in the collection fleet and so the timing of any such change needs to be carefully considered in order to reduce as far as possible any amortisation costs from the current fleet.
- 1.2.3 Finally, we consider what the next steps should be for the Council to take in relation to the service areas.

### **1.3 Methodology**

- 1.3.1 To assess CDC's performance in terms of the volumes of waste collected, we have examined the three main waste streams collected and compared these, in terms of kg per household for each stream and in total with comparable authorities. We have also commented on where Chichester's performance fits overall within the statistics for English authorities.



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

- 1.3.2 This approach, which takes into account demographic factors and the Index of Multiple Deprivation, gives a more meaningful comparison than the overall WRAP models. We have used the statistics for 2014/15, which are the latest available on a national, audited basis; but we have commented upon changes before and since that date in terms of Chichester's services and tonnages.
- 1.3.3 To assess the quality of street cleansing and grounds maintenance services we have carried out unannounced site inspections at various locations within the District.
- 1.3.4 We presented our interim findings, focussing on current performance in particular, to Council Officers in November 2016.
- 1.3.5 With regard to our headline assessment of efficiency and value for money for all services, we have broken down the operational statistics and costs and provided commentary on them; and then compared these to others in our database. This database includes data from many operations in the South of England in particular, for both in-house operations and those which are contracted out. Our private sector information is regularly updated from the results of recent tenders.
- 1.3.6 In terms of detailed actions to inform parts of our report we have attended at Chichester to discuss current costs and other performance statistics; and we have attended at the depot on two occasions.
- 1.3.7 In this final draft report we have considered both elements together (performance and costs); and set out our findings. This includes consideration of alternative scenarios and the way forward from now.
- 1.3.8 We would like to thank the Officers of Chichester District Council for their assistance in regard to providing data that we have used, which has enabled this report to be completed in a timely fashion.

Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance







## 2.0 Performance – Waste and Recycling

### 2.1 Overall

2.1.1 As noted in the consultants’ brief the *“Council’s recycling rate has plateaued over the last few years, between 38-40%”*. This is confirmed by analysing recent publically available data: in 2014/15 Chichester DC achieved an overall recycling/composting diversion of 38.4%, a slight decrease in performance compared to 2013/14 (39.5%). In relation to all other English waste collection authorities (WCAs) Chichester’s overall performance is below average, with high performing authorities having a separate food waste collection and, in some cases, a free garden waste service. We understand, however, that during 2016 the Council has put significant efforts into improving its recycling/compost rate which for 2015/16 climbed to just over 40% and reached 42.8% for the first quarter 2016/16. Forecasts for the second and third quarters 2016/17 suggest that this improvement has continued.

2.1.2 Table 1 compares Chichester’s performance with its CIPFA Nearest Neighbours (NN), listed in order of socio-demographic similarity to Chichester. This indicates that Chichester’s overall performance is the third lowest compared with its Nearest Neighbours, ranging from 60.3% (Stratford-on-Avon) to 32% (Test Valley) in 2014/15 (the latest available year for which data for all English authorities is publicly available).

**Table 1: Recycling/Composting (%) for Chichester and its Nearest Neighbours (2014/15)**

NN	Authority	Recycling %	Composting %	Total %
(0)	<b>Chichester</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>38.4</b>
(1)	Stratford-on-Avon	25.2	35.1	60.3
(2)	Wychavon	30.8	12.2	43.0
(3)	Cotswold	23.1	34.9	58.0
(4)	Horsham	22.1	22.4	44.5



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

(5)	South Hams	23.2	30.2	53.4
(6)	Tunbridge Wells	21.2	25.5	46.7
(7)	Winchester	22.4	13.0	35.3
(8)	East Hertfordshire	23.0	26.5	49.5
(9)	Tonbridge & Malling	13.2	29.2	42.4
(10)	Test Valley	24.2	7.8	32.0
(11)	Ashford	31.8	23.5	55.3
(12)	Uttlesford	32.0	18.2	50.3
(13)	East Devon	26.8	19.5	46.3
(14)	Suffolk Coastal	27.0	29.5	56.5
(15)	Mid Sussex	27.9	11.7	39.5

2.1.3 Looking at dry recycling performance only, demonstrates that the Council achieved upper quartile performance compared to other English authorities in 2014/15: it diverted 27.9% recyclable material and is ranked 35<sup>th</sup> from 229 WCAs. Similarly, amongst the benchmark group Chichester's recycling performance is above average.

2.1.4 In contrast, Chichester collects much less garden and/or food waste than other authorities: its composting rate is 10.5%, which is lower quartile performance in England (at 191<sup>st</sup> amongst 229 collection authorities). Compared to its benchmark group, Chichester collects the second lowest amount of compostable material. This is entirely understandable given that Chichester operates a chargeable garden waste service and eleven authorities in the benchmark group collected garden waste and/or food waste as part of routine collections (and, therefore, free of any charge) in 2014/15.



## 2.2 Kerbside Collections

We have used two methods for comparing the relative performance at Chichester:

- Nearest Neighbor Comparison: CIPFA (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy) provides a Nearest Neighbor Model which enables an authority to identify the most similar authorities to itself based on a series of default and bespoke variables; this creates a Nearest Neighbor group of similar authorities.
- Comparison with similar authorities: Our experience has shown that looking at the Index for Multiple Deprivation is key in making comparisons, since there is a direct relationship between the score (IMDs) and performance in relation to waste. So we have compared the councils performance with similar authorities based on this.

### Chichester Compared with CIPFA Nearest Neighbors

2.2.1 Table 2 compares Chichester’s performance with its CIPFA Nearest Neighbours (NN), listed in order of socio-demographic similarity to Chichester. The table shows Chichester’s kerbside collection performance in kg per household per year (kg/hh/yr) in 2014/15, the latest available year for which data for all English authorities is publicly available.

2.2.2 Compared with its Nearest Neighbours, Chichester has the 5<sup>th</sup> highest yield in kg/hh/yr for kerbside dry recycling (above the average of 176kg/hh/yr), the 5<sup>th</sup> lowest yield for kerbside garden waste (or mixed composting), the seventh highest yield for kerbside residual waste and the fifth lowest yield for total kerbside waste. Chichester does not collect food waste compared with ten of its Nearest Neighbours who do.

**Table 2: Kerbside Yields (kg/hh/yr) for Chichester and its Nearest Neighbours**

NN	Authority	Recycling (exc. rejects)	Food	Garden/ Mixed	Residual +rejects	Total
(0)	Chichester	209	0	81	382	672
(1)	Stratford-on-Avon	232	0	343 <sup>#</sup>	380	955



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

(2)	Wychavon	233	0	95	445	773
(3)	Cotswold	186	0	331±	327	844
(4)	Horsham	204	0	211	493	909
(5)	South Hams	119	0	223#	374	715
(6)	Tunbridge Wells	131	0	247#	434	811
(7)	Winchester	144	0	96	422	662
(8)	East Hertfordshire	202	0	243#	425	870
(9)	Tonbridge & Malling	57	0	282#	483	821
(10)	Test Valley	133	0	60	473	666
(11)	Ashford	240	98	86	304	729
(12)	Uttlesford	248	86	28	414	777
(13)	East Devon	142	88	5	316	551
(14)	Suffolk Coastal	147	0	248#	342	737
(15)	Mid Sussex	192	0	80	369	640
<i>Average</i>		<i>176</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>166</i>	<i>399</i>	<i>758</i>

# Food and garden waste collected together so reported as combined kg/hh

± Food waste collected separately from garden waste but reported together

Note: Cotswold, East Devon, East Herts, South Hams, Tonbridge & Malling - rejects from DEFRA published statistics

2.2.3 For the same authorities, those that collect fully co-mingled recyclables including glass tend to collect more than authorities with different collection types. The lowest-performing authorities collect materials separately as well as only targeting a small range of materials.



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

2.2.4 Where dry recyclate is collected co-mingled (with or without glass) it is inevitable that there will be a degree of contamination identified during the MRF process. Contamination rates in the UK have increased sharply following the tightening of regulations in 2014; and also as a result of the MRF operators being more careful in accurately measuring them as a result of a change in regulations and as a result of the fall in material values. Contamination rates in CDC have improved markedly over the last 2 / 3 years. CDC's average contamination for 2016 was 4.9%, which is considerably below the UK national average of ca. 14%.

### Chichester Compared with Similar IMD Authorities

2.2.5 We also compared Chichester with authorities with IMDs within 10 points of Chichester (i.e. 3.5 to 23.5) that collect residual waste fortnightly from bins and collect recycling either fully co-mingled or in separate streams.

2.2.6 Chichester has a kerbside recycling yield that is slightly lower than the benchmark for authorities that collect co-mingled including glass using 240 litre bins as standard, but quite a bit lower than authorities with smaller residual waste bins.

2.2.7 3.3.4 Chichester has a significantly higher kerbside recycling yield than authorities that collect recyclate in separate streams, regardless of frequency and container types.

## **2.3 Garden Waste**

2.3.1 Chichester DC operates a chargeable collection service for garden waste which services nearly 13,000 customers. Currently the charge is £49 per household per annum when paying by direct debit (£56.50 if paid by credit/debit card). Collection rounds have been reconfigured in order to absorb future service growth, which the council intends to achieve by March 2017.

2.3.2 We have examined Chichester's Nearest Neighbours to determine which authorities currently operate a chargeable garden waste service. Chichester collects the highest amount of material per household compared to the other authorities and the percentage of householders using the service is about average.

2.3.3 Chichester's annual subscription rate is among the higher in the benchmark group, but this has not limited the number of subscribers, which are about average. The recent initiative to



increase the number of customers is making good progress, and could divert a significant extra tonnage for composting.

### **2.4 Bulky Waste**

- 2.4.1 The Council operates a collection service for bulky household waste, including fridges and freezers. Residents can book a collection at a cost of £20 for the first item and £15 for each additional item up to eight in total. As part of the Council's improvement plan charges have been revised and an online booking system has been introduced which is reducing processing time.
- 2.4.2 We considered the charges levied by Chichester in relation to its Nearest Neighbours, including their indices of multiple deprivation (IMD).
- 2.4.3 The average cost to the customers of these authorities is £26, with Chichester charging less than this at £20.

### **2.5 Commercial Waste**

- 2.5.1 The Council operates a commercial waste service which is accounted for separately in a way which we believe is entirely appropriate. The accounts show that it delivered a healthy surplus in 2015/16.
- 2.5.2 It is rare to find a municipal commercial waste operation as successful as Chichester's, and which keeps its accounts in a format which shows the activity separately and with clear cost centres and operating profit: we commend the Council for these achievements.

### **2.6 Conclusions/Recommendations**

- 2.6.1 Chichester District Council is already performing well in terms of waste minimization, and is reaching upper quartile performance in terms of recycling diversion. However, opportunities to increase recycling/composting performance further and reduce the amount of waste generated are constantly reviewed.
- 2.6.2 The Council performs well in terms of dry recycling and in terms of waste minimisation. This is excellent performance, and the only area for potential improvement might be to look at



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

how the contamination rate could be further reduced. The Council's overall performance when recycling & composting are combined is however somewhat lower performing.

- 2.6.3 In terms of more significantly improving its performance, there are really only two options: to abandon the current chargeable system for garden waste collection; or to introduce a food waste collection service. We consider that both would mean an exponential increase in costs: the former is more expensive since it involves lost income as well as increased collection costs, giving a combined net increase of ca. £1.25 million per annum plus one-off costs for wheeled-bins.
- 2.6.4 The optimum time to introduce a food waste collection service would be in two to three years' time when the bulk of the current collection fleet comes up for replacement. However, even taking into account this optimisation, the costs would increase by ca. £550,000 per annum plus one-off costs of ca. £365,000 for containers and publicity.
- 2.6.5 Although recycling / composting rates continue to be measured, it is not at all clear what will happen in terms of the UK's overall performance after the UK leaves the EU. With this uncertainty plus the very significant costs, we would urge the Council to be cautious in changing much, unless funding were to be forthcoming for the food waste option from the Disposal Authority. We believe that it would be appropriate for the Council to open discussions on this point with West Sussex County Council.
- 2.6.6 The Council could consider increasing its charges for bulky waste as these are on the low side in comparison with benchmark authorities.
- 2.6.7 With regard to garden waste, we understand that current policy is to retain the customer level of charge and look to increase the customer base: this seems to us to be a sensible policy to go forward with.
- 2.6.8 In summary, the Council is making progress in increasing its customer base whilst retaining its charge: this seems a sensible policy going forward. We understand that in 2016 there has been an increase in customers of over 1,500 following a successful promotional campaign.
- 2.6.9 While the charge levied by Chichester is reasonable on the basis of this benchmarking data we would suggest that there may be merit in considering an increase in bulky waste charges at Chichester.



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

2.6.10 The Council has a highly successful Commercial Waste operation which we commend.





## 3.0 Performance – Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

### 3.1 Street Cleansing

- 3.1.1 WYG conducted street cleansing inspections (on an unannounced basis) in October.
- 3.1.2 To assess the quality of street cleansing that is currently being delivered, randomly selected transects across a selection of land uses were inspected using the standard NI195 grading system.
- 3.1.3 Particular attention was paid to Chichester city centre and the surrounding recreation areas, as well as to Midhurst, Selsey and Wittering. It is important to note that the survey was conducted during school holidays thus areas of Main Retail and nearby Recreation Areas are expected to have higher footfall and provide more of a challenge to maintaining high standards of environmental quality from a cleansing perspective.
- 3.1.4 Although such a methodology cannot be considered as thorough as a comprehensive performance assessment, it does provide an accurate snapshot of the current situation with regard to street cleansing at the locations visited as well as a useful picture of general performance. In addition to the standard NI195 elements (litter, detritus, graffiti and fly-posting), we also measured the presence of weed growth and observed grounds maintenance.

#### Chichester

- 3.1.5 Overall Street cleansing in Chichester was of a high standard, particularly in the city centre and other areas of high footfall. Many instances of spotless road channels were observed such as St Martin's Square and Little London. There were some light scatterings of small litter around benches in East Street, but no instances of detritus, graffiti, fly-posting or weeds were observed. In the areas surrounding the city centre cleansing standards again were at a relatively high level, instances of fly-posting and graffiti were few and far between, and road channels were predominantly free from detritus and litter. Car parks in these areas were also observed to be cleansed to a high standard.
- 3.1.6 One a section of the A27 Chichester Bypass had large accumulation of detritus and weeds in the road channel, however we recognise there are severe operational difficulties in cleansing



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

high speed roads such as the A27 and cleansing can only be really effected with (expensive) road closures.

### Midhurst

- 3.1.7 Overall standards of street cleanliness were very good in the retail areas. In the surrounding residential roads standards of street cleansing dropped slightly particularly for detritus. Improvements could be made by paying particular attention to the backline and road channels with the presence of parked cars and possibly a more regular litter pick of the Holmbush Way Playground.

### Selsey

- 3.1.8 Overall standards of street cleanliness were very high especially the residential areas surveyed around Lifeboat Way. The clearance of detritus and increased treatment and removal of weeds would also improve the overall environmental quality of the area

### East Wittering and West Wittering

- 3.1.9 Street cleansing performance in Wittering was to a good standard particularly in terms of litter, graffiti and fly posting. More attention could be paid to the removal of detritus in the road channels of the streets mentioned above

## **3.2 Grounds Maintenance**

### Chichester

- 3.2.1 Grounds maintenance areas across Chichester appeared to be maintained to a very high standard. The grounds maintenance features around the city centre appeared to be extremely well presented and maintained.
- 3.2.2 A number of gardens such as Bishops Palace Gardens, Jubilee Gardens and New Park Road Memorial Gardens were observed and found to be maintained to a very good standard.
- 3.2.3 A number of other recreation areas and sports pitches were also observed including but not limited to Priory Park, Oaklands Park, New Park Road Park and Sherbourne Road; the majority of which were maintained to a very high standard for litter, detritus, graffiti, fly-posting and weeds.



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

- 3.2.4 Priory Park had some minor incidences of graffiti on picnic benches and a few pieces of litter scattered around the children's play area but was otherwise very well maintained including the cricket pitch and bowling green.
- 3.2.5 Grounds maintenance across the district appeared to be maintained to a very high standard. Flower beds and gardens around the city centre were aesthetically pleasing; sports pitches and recreation areas were well kept and the majority of children's play areas were in very good condition despite it being a school holiday.

### **3.3 Conclusions/Recommendations**

- 3.3.1 Our site inspections showed the quality of street cleansing and grounds maintenance services delivered by the in-house team to be excellent overall. We know that there are concerns regarding the cleanliness standard of A roads (including but not limited to the A27); if higher standards are desired this almost certainly requires an increased budget owing to changed procedures governed by law which have increased the cost of such operations exponentially.
- 3.3.2 We do not pretend that our site inspections of street cleansing standards are as comprehensive as a full LEQ (Local Environmental Quality) survey, although we use the same methodology in calculating scores. From our sample we note that the failure rate for litter was 2.5%, and for detritus 6%; with no failings for graffiti and flyposting. Contractor performance for shire district councils is generally not set at such a tight level: we know of nearby authorities with targets of 4% for litter, 8% for detritus and 1% each for graffiti and flyposting.
- 3.3.3 Generally street cleansing in and around Chichester city centre is to a very good standard, it is evident that sufficient resources and street cleansing and ground maintenance regimes are used within the city centre focusing on the main retail and heavy footfall areas. As you move away from the city centre towards more residential areas occurrences of primarily detritus and weeds do increase slightly but standards are still very good.



## 4.0 Value for Money

### Waste Services

- 4.0.1 Our brief required a high level assessment of the waste collection service, street cleansing service and grounds maintenance service and to advise whether the services are operating efficiently and effectively and represent good value for money.
- 4.0.2 In this section we also consider whether the services could be delivered efficiently and effectively and at lower cost by an alternative service provider.
- 4.0.3 The waste services that are included in our value for money comparison are refuse, recycling, garden waste and bulky waste service. We do not consider the commercial waste operation as our analysis has indicated a very sound operation.
- 4.0.4 The first stage in terms of estimating the cost of collection for the domestic waste service (refuse and recycling) is to calculate the resources required for an alternate weekly collection of refuse and recycling. Our assessment includes a provision for properties classed as flats and maisonettes which require slightly different collections.
- 4.0.5 Our productivities are based on our understanding of how services would be expected to be delivered, and the rural/urban mix of the district. We also consider the tonnages of waste to be collected, in particular the residual waste tonnages which will be higher than the recycle.
- 4.0.6 We have included a dedicated provision required to undertake bulky waste collections and bin delivery plus other ad-hoc tasks; and a provision for spare resources, used to support the contract in the event of breakdowns.
- 4.0.7 A private sector contractor would be expected to resource the management side of the operation slightly differently to that currently seen, and we have considered the impact on corporate overheads.
- 4.0.8 If the services were outsourced then the Council would require a 'client' side to monitor the contractor's performance, but with all these considerations taken into account, we are clear that the Council would not be financially better off by using a private sector supplier, instead of delivering its own services.



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

4.0.9 We should also note at this point that exposing the service to competition would incur one-off costs: and the quality of the outcome might not be as high as is currently delivered. A number of outsourced operations in rural districts currently see high levels of missed collections.

4.0.10 We have calculated private sector costs for the various services: it is important to note that our estimates are based on a broad-brush basis (particularly for street cleansing and grounds maintenance); we have had to ignore relatively minor factors such as depot costs (in a contracted-out situation these costs typically remain with the council), and if we were to include these they would show the costs of the private sector to be higher than our calculations.

### Street Cleansing Services

4.0.11 CDC delivers its street cleansing services on an output / outcome basis rather than a frequency basis. We consider the outcomes to be high; and rather higher than are often delivered by private contractors to shire districts.

4.0.12 To calculate a likely private sector cost, we have (as we have for waste) considered the overall level of resource which we believe a private sector estimator would allow for and applied unit rates. In terms of the resource we have assumed that about the same level of quality is required.

4.0.13 We have considered the interactions expected between mechanical and manual resources, and the workloads these resources can manage in a district such as Chichester.

4.0.14 We have considered the resources required to undertake specific tasks such as managing dog bins and cleansing smaller towns such as Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey, the Witterings).

4.0.15 We note that Chichester City centre includes a pedestrianised area: we have therefore allowed specialist resources to tackle these areas and work with the other town centre resources, to deliver the standards required.

4.0.16 We feel that some provision would need to be made for overtime to as well as temporary / agency cover for leaf clearing; so we have added costs to cover this.



## Waste, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

4.0.17 Again, it is important to consider that if the service were outsourced then the Council would require a 'client' side to monitor the contractor's performance. We are of the opinion that the Council would not be financially better off by using a private sector supplier.

4.0.18 Our estimate does not include any additional costs associated with road closures for the cleansing of high speed roads: we think that this subject needs careful consideration in terms of budget setting in future years.

### **4.1 Conclusions/Recommendations**

4.1.1 We are quite clear that we see no advantage to the Council in outsourcing or market-testing these services at this point in time: in arriving at this conclusion we have had to consider the costs of the Council undertaking a 'client' function. We have not calculated a cost for market-testing but if this were included it would simply add weight to our conclusions.



## 5.0 Looking forward

- 5.0.1 Having established that the Council operation is delivering good standards for a price that would be unlikely to be significantly improved by outsourcing, the Council needs to ensure that it is positioned to maintain this situation. The challenge is to future-proof the services.
- 5.0.2 The services that we have reviewed have been well managed and improved in the past and there are clearly some highly skilled people in the team: the challenge for the Council now is to establish a structure that will be resilient for the future.
- 5.0.3 The future of the service will rely on skills being retained and developed, but also investment (money, time, training, personnel) into the organisation to ensure it is able to develop in line with service changes and any legislative changes.