

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

Meeting:	Environment and Economy Scrutiny Sub-Committee
Date:	September 27 th 2004
Subject:	Waste Management BVPIs
Key decision:	No
Responsible Chief Officer:	Area Director (Urban Living)
Relevant Portfolio Holder:	Environment and Transport
Status:	Part 1
Ward:	All wards
Enclosures:	N/A

1. **Summary/ Reason for urgency (if applicable)**

- 1.1 The council has commissioned a report from consultants to analyse the council's BVPI indicators and compare and contrast them with indicators from other London Boroughs.

2. **Recommendations** (for the Sub-Committee)

- 2.1 **That the Sub-Committee note the contents of the report and any comments be forwarded to the Portfolio Holder.**

3. **Consultation with Ward Councillors**

- 3.1 None

4. **Policy Context (including Relevant Previous Decisions)**

- 4.1 Refuse Best Value Review Partnership and Best Value Panel March 2001

5. **Relevance to Corporate Priorities**

- 5.1 This report addresses the Council's stated priority of "enhancing the environment in Harrow by keeping the Borough clean and attractive, by promoting higher environmental standards and by bringing about more sustainable transport activity".

6. **Background Information and options considered**

- 6.1 The sub-committee is currently reviewing the waste management service

6.2 As part of the Best Value Inspection, the council commissioned a report from Environmental Resources Management, environmental consultants. The Aims and Objectives of the Review were: -

“to comment on the strategy, policy and services provided by the Council, in relation to the Borough’s performance against waste-related BVPIs, and to compare the Council’s performance with that of other London authorities.

The review also seeks to highlight those areas where the Council is performing well, demonstrating significant improvements in the services it provides and identifying strengths in service provision. The report also identifies areas for improvement and, where appropriate, identifies the council’s proposed actions to improve its performance.”

6.3 ERM were asked to be the council’s Critical Friend in this review. As part of this function they also participated in the EFQM self-assessment of the waste management service, which has produced a detailed Improvement Plan for the service.

7. **Main Findings**

7.1 **BVPI 82 a) and b)**

The council has made good progress in increasing its recycling rate over the last year. I.e. from 9.4% in 2002/3 to 13.2% in 2003/4. This is principally due to the changes at the Civic Amenity Site and the introduction of the Brown Bin scheme. The council has a good strategy in place to deliver the statutory BVPI for 2005/6 of 25.2% (enhanced LPSA target).

The recycling rate in the first four months of 2004/5 was 18.8%

7.2 **BVPI 84**

Over the past four years Harrow has recorded a relatively low rate of growth in waste arisings compared to the average position in West London and North London. The annual growth being approx. 1% compared to a national average of 3%. This reflects the good coverage of home composting bins and the policy of only collecting waste that is contained within the bin.

The borough has recently adopted a Waste Minimisation Plan, which should continue to promote the waste minimisation message. The overall aim of the Plan is to stabilise waste arisings at 460 kg per head of population with an annual increase of only 1% in the long term.

7.3 **BVPI 86**

The cost of waste collection has risen significantly in Harrow over the last four years and this has moved the council from 15th most expensive in 2000/01 to 4th most expensive in 2003/04. The cost per household has doubled in this period.

The report identifies a number of reasons for this increase:-

- Additional resources and crews introduced following the Best Value Review, and tendering exercise, in 2001/2 to improve service delivery.
- Introduction of the Single Status agreement, This has had a significant impact on the workforce, which was poorly paid under the old CCT regime.
- The introduction of the Brown Bin scheme for organic waste has concentrated on good service delivery. As the scheme is rolled out across the borough there will be some economies of scale which can be realised
- Section 52(9) charges form WLWA
- Call Centre costs
- Capital financing charges for the organic waste scheme have also been included. This relates to capital expenditure financed by government grant. The Local authority

Accounting SORP requires that capital financing charges to apply where fixed assets are required, however they are financed.

The costs going into BVPI 86 will be the subject of a detailed review exercise. The review will include comparisons with other wheeled bin authorities. Some are one-off costs, which will drop out of the calculation in the future.

8. Consultation

8.1 None

9. Finance Observations

9.1 None

10. Legal Observations

10.1 None

11. Conclusions

12. Background Papers

12.1 ERM report, "A Critical of Waste Management BVPIs & Discussion of related Waste Strategy, Policy and Service Issues

13. Author

Andrew Baker Waste Management Policy Officer Ext. 2779

E-mail: andrew.baker@harrow.gov.uk