

Public Document Pack



OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Monday, 11 March 2019 at 6.00 pm
Conference Room, Civic Centre, Silver
Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA

Contact: Stacey Gilmour
Scrutiny Officer
Direct: 020-8379-4187
Tel: 020-8379-1000

E-mail: Stacey.Gilmour@enfield.gov.uk
Council website: www.enfield.gov.uk

AGENDA PART 1 TO FOLLOW PAPER

3. CALL IN OF DECISION: POTENTIAL CHANGES TO WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTIONS (Pages 1 - 4)

To receive the response to the reasons provided for the Call-in by a Cabinet Member responsible for taking the decision.

This page is intentionally left blank

Reason why decision is being called in:

1. **3.13 states ‘the feedback from the consultation has been conscientiously considered to help inform the recommendation for change’ whereas 3.30 says that the primary driver of the evaluation is the financial, savings that can be achieved. Are these two statements not at odds with one another?**

Response:

Paragraph 3.30 states the primary driver of the evaluation is the financial savings that can be achieved. This paragraph clearly states that the evaluation also takes into account conformity with the Mayor’s Environment Strategy, and the responses to the Consultation. Paragraph 3.13 states the Consultation sought residents’ views on the seven proposals and retaining the current collection system. The feedback from the Consultation has been conscientiously considered to help inform the recommendation for change and is demonstrated in the report at paragraph 3.45 which sets out ‘you said we will’ and covers four pages of the report (pages 13-16). This means paragraph 3.13 supports paragraph 3.30 rather than be at odds.

2. **Table 9 says “there is no correlation between charging for garden waste and/or collecting refuse fortnightly with significant increases in fly tipping” but then goes on to say that additional recycling and enforcement resources will be employed during the mobilisation stage to ensure the service rolls out smoothly and no unforeseen impacts occur such as increased fly tipping! As it then goes on to specifically mention the two new jobs and new street cleaning operatives what are these additional resources?**

Response:

There is no correlation between the proposed changes and increasing fly tipping and this is stated within Table 9. The paragraph then says that additional recycling and enforcement resources will be employed during the mobilisation stage to ensure the service rolls out smoothly and no unforeseen impacts occur such as increased fly tipping. The key point here is that we are taking sensible and prudent approach to mobilisation and will have in place resources to deal with ‘unforeseen’ impacts and perceived issues to enable the smooth roll-out of the changes. This means that the resource planned for during changes will be a temporary resource during the mobilisation period.

The report doesn’t refer to two new jobs, in Table 9 it states that there will be four new permanent jobs. These will be two recycling officers and two enforcement officers. The report also states that there will be a substantial communication budget (£120k for the mobilisation and £100k year-on-year) to help raise awareness of the service and improve engagement with residents. For example, communications and marketing will be developed that raise awareness of what can be recycled and how people can manage their waste better. Both recycling officers and enforcement officers use communication and education tools to first engage with residents, formal warnings and enforcement only follow as a last measure.

Table 9 of the report refers to £500k growth investment into the street cleansing and fly tipping service, these are examples of how we can invest in improving the borough in areas that we already know have challenges. The report provides an

example of what this would equate to in terms of resource such as street cleansing operatives.

- 3. The report fails to talk about missed collections because as it stands you need to report them within one working day. If you are away or cannot get through to the call centre etc. are you then expected to wait another two weeks before collection? There is no mention of giving a slightly longer time period for people to get in contact.**

Response:

Missed collections is addressed in Table 9. It states that LBE's policy is that any bin not collected due to the collection crew will be collected within one working day. It is proposed that the current policy remains.

- 4. 3.59 - £1.06 million for dedicated mobilisation team - the report does not set out whether new vehicles are needed for weekly food waste collection?**

Response:

New food waste vehicles are accounted within the savings modelling.

- 5. 6.1.6 vehicle and staffing costs are calculated from the reduced number of vehicles rounds but how is weekly food waste fitting into this?**

Response:

New food waste vehicles are accounted for within the savings modelling and have been taken into account. The overall number of vehicles has a net reduction of six HGV's.

- 6. 6.1.16 - it talks about reducing existing agency staff. It does not go into detail on the number of agency staff that will leave.**

Response:

The number of agency workers we currently use will reduce by 19. We will be creating 4 permanent posts of 2 recycling officers and 2 enforcement officers plus up to the equivalent of 19 street sweeping posts resulting in up to 23 new jobs being created within Environmental services.

- 7. The result of the consultation was that 66% of respondents wanted to keep the current service yet the option taken forward was the least supported out of all them.**

Response:

The report explains that LBE has been clear from the start of this process what the criteria for evaluating the proposals would be and that this information was also

published in the consultation documents to ensure transparency and fairness. These were primarily financial savings, and then conformity with the London Mayor's Environment Strategy and to consider the responses of the consultation.

Financial savings for Proposal 7 were significantly higher when compared to any other proposal or the current collection system and would make a considerable single contribution to the budget gap. It conforms with the Mayor's Environment Strategy by providing separate food waste collections and has a projected step change in recycling to 49%. The report recognises that Proposal 7 was the least preferred amongst the respondents of the consultation at 9%. With the exception of retaining the current system there was no clear majority for any of the other proposals. However, the current service would, in fact, require an increase in costs to retain the services which Members took into consideration.

Those who responded negatively were asked how the change might impact on their household. Respondents were also asked what could be put in place to help manage change. The report sets out a range of reasons why respondents thought one of the proposed changes would have a negative impact on their household. These were addressed in the report and a range of supportive measures developed to help mitigate against any negative impact.

8. The decision does not state how much Eunomia was paid for its work on this decision?

Response:

The total on consultants in the review of the bin collection service is £66,419.53 excluding VAT.

9. Redbridge Council moved to a paid for garden waste collection service and had to reverse its decision. Eunomia states that it has high confidence levels for the take up of this, but that was not the case in Redbridge and it is a very similar borough to Enfield. Why was there not any information on this and how we will not have the same the problems?

Response:

Redbridge moved to a charged garden service using biodegradable sacks. These sacks were not suitable to contain garden waste. Redbridge provides a sack collection for refuse which means refuse waste is not restricted therefore residents used the refuse collection to dispose of garden waste. LBE proposes to use wheeled bins for garden waste collections and retain the current refuse wheeled bin which will encourage waste reduction and recycling. LBE is also providing supportive measures such free compostable bins and trialing free collection points, details are provided in Table 9 of the report.

The service and financial modelling have been produced by Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd using proven sophisticated software specially designed for the waste and recycling industry. Eunomia have worked with over 170 local authorities nationally to help them make savings and redesign services.

Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd has worked with LBE for several years, consequently they have detailed knowledge of the service, its key cost drivers and the factors that influence those drivers. These metrics have been tested by operational managers and have been used to create a robust and detailed cost model that underpins the savings created by the chosen proposal

- 10. It states in 3.36 *The Mayor has regulatory powers to ensure that the statutory waste authorities' plans, services and contracts are in general conformity with Mayoral waste strategies and policies. The Mayor has the power to direct a waste collection authority where their waste activities are considered detrimental to the implementation of the municipal waste provisions of the London Environment Strategy. The Mayor also has a role to play in facilitating and supporting good practice. Why then did the Cabinet Member put 3 options that did not comply with the Mayor's Environment Strategy on the table as part of the consultation?***

Response:

The Mayor does have power to direct that the strategies are in conformity to the Environment Strategy but no legal powers of enforcement and accordingly it was felt that options not in conformity with the Strategy could put to the public for their consideration. We were guided by one of the principles laid down in authoritative case law that consultation must take place when the proposal is still at a formative stage. All options were operationally deliverable and therefore were included in the consultation. The final decision was based on the criteria set out from the start and made by Members in the wider organisational context.