

# THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL

## REDESIGN BOARD WORKSHOP – 14 FEBRUARY 2017

Agenda Item	
Report No	

### STREET CLEANSING REVIEW

#### REPORT BY SENIOR WARD MANAGER - ROSS, SKYE AND LOCHABER

##### Summary

This report outlines the work carried out the Street Cleansing Review Team, sets out options for the future work of the Service and highlights the implications of the proposals.

### 1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 The purpose of the review is to make recommendations for redesign of the Street Cleansing service that will:

- a) find savings and/or income that will help the Council meet its affordability challenge;
- b) be mindful of the principles of redesign; and
- c) appraise the ten options for service delivery

1.2 The primary activities of the service are as follows (**Appendix 1** sets out the full service summary)

- Manual litter collection
- Manual sweeping
- Removal of dog fouling
- Fly-tipping removal
- Dead animals
- Litter Bins
- Dog Bins
- Leaf collection
- Mechanical sweeping of footways
- Mechanical sweeping of roadways
- Road verge litter collection
- Chewing Gum removal
- Graffiti Removal

### 2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 The Review Team which considered the Street Cleansing function comprised:

- Dot Ferguson, Senior Ward Manager (Team Leader)
- Alan McKinnie, Operations Manager
- Stephen Carr, Principal Policy Officer
- Andy Summers, Head of Environmental and Amenity Services
- Paul MacPherson, GMB
- Cllr Alister MacKinnon, Redesign Board representative
- Cllr Alasdair Christie, Redesign Board representative

2.2 The Team has been supported with input from a number of other Community Services staff.

**2.3** A number of processes have been used in order to assess available information and gather evidence and ideas from other authorities. A review of all the activities listed at paragraph 1.2 was undertaken with nothing being ruled out of scope. The following assessments have been carried out:

- a) review of statutory duty as set out in the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse, section 89 of Environmental Protection Act 1990
- b) review of how Highland performs when compared with other authorities
- c) review of performance as considered by residents
- d) review of out-turn costs for years 2013/14 – 2015/16
- e) review of working practices – this involved discussions with management and workforce on both current delivery model and potential improvements
- f) assessment of current fleet and investigations in to more efficient alternatives
- g) assessment of good practice and innovation elsewhere

**2.4** In addition, discussions were held with the workforce and questions asked of the Citizens' Panel (responses are at **Appendix 3**).

### **3.0 OBSERVATIONS ARISING FROM ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION**

**3.1 a) review of statutory duty as set out in the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse (COPLAR), section 89 of Environmental Protection Act 1990** – the Code of Practice sets out the bodies responsible for keeping their land clear of litter and refuse and requires them *“to make sure that public land and roads under their control are kept free from litter and refuse as far as is practicably possible and within reason.”* Compliance is measured in two ways a) cleanliness grades which set out how clean an area should be and b) cleanliness standards which indicate response times for cleaning up. The cleanliness grades (which are provided in photographic form) range from Grade A (no litter or refuse) through to Grade D (heavily littered with significant accumulations). Town centres and residential areas throughout Highland require to be maintained at Grade A (litter free). If these areas fall below Grade A the timescale within which the Duty Body should return these areas to a litter free state are defined in COPLAR. However, COPLAR is currently under review by Scottish Government and Local Authorities will be required to rezone all land which is to be kept litter free. There is little further information available at this time about the impacts of the review.

The Local Environmental Audit and Management System (LEAMS) has been adopted as the statutory performance indicator for cleanliness standards by Audit Scotland and as such must be used by all 32 Scottish local authorities to assess cleanliness standards. LEAMS is the recommended minimum level of cleanliness monitoring required to measure cleanliness levels and assess improvements over time, over a council-wide area. LEAMS requires Local Authorities to carry out two audits within their areas each financial year. Keep Scotland Beautiful carries out a third audit to provide independent validation.

The Code also sets out a range of enforcement actions which can be taken (see Section 5 below) - however, some are currently not in force.

**b) review of how Highland performs when compared with other authorities** – according to the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF), Highland Council performs well with regard to street cleaning when compared with other areas.

In 2014/15 it was the fifth-best performing area in Scotland, scoring 98% compared to a Scottish average of 94%. Highland spends £11,283 per 1,000 people on street cleaning compared to the Scottish average of £15,816.

**c) review of performance as considered by residents** – the LGBF data indicates a 74% public satisfaction rate with street cleansing in Highland (which is also the average Scottish satisfaction rate).

A survey of the Highland Council's Citizen's Panel in 2016 indicated a net satisfaction rate of 35%, however this has decreased from 43% in 2015. Only 10% of respondents indicated that street cleaning was one of the top five most important services to them.

**d) review of out-turn costs for years 2013/14 – 2015/16** – reviewing the out-turn figures identified a total budget of around £3.2 million (2013/14) reducing to £2.88 million (2015/16).

Looking solely at the 2015/16 budget:

- staff costs equate to around £2million (69%);
- plant and vehicle costs £770,000 (27%)

The remaining 4% of costs relates to disposal of waste materials; purchase of materials, workshop consumables etc.

Percentage area spend is as follows:

Nairn	6.3%
Skye	6.3%
Badenoch and Strathspey	8%
Lochaber	9.4%
Caithness	12%
Ross and Cromarty	12.6%
Sutherland	15%
Inverness	30%

In considering the above in terms of increasing budget pressures and reducing costs, the only areas where meaningful savings can be realised are in more efficient working patterns / staff reductions and plant / vehicle costs. With regard to the former, this can most effectively be achieved by changes to terms and conditions.

1. Planned weekend overtime is currently around £135,000. By doing less, a saving of around £27,000 could be achieved. This would mean reducing the service in Inverness, Caithness and Lochaber and would have an impact on the standard of cleanliness. Due to the low number of overtime hours currently used in the other Highland areas, any further reduction would result in the withdrawal of weekend street-cleansing.
2. In addition, if contracted hours were reduced from 37 to 35 hours per week, this would result in an annual saving of around £97,000. However, this would be a change to terms and conditions and concerns have been raised that this would impact on lower-paid members of staff. *However consideration should be given to rolling this out across all HC staff.*
3. Job reductions save on average £27,750 per job (including oncosts) but will impact on standards of cleanliness and response times. Deletion of posts currently being held vacant is also considered preferable to making staff redundant.

**e) review of working practices – this involved discussions with management and workforce on both current delivery model and potential improvements** – discussions with the workforce have indicated that reworking routes could provide some minor improvements and small cost savings. More effective use of technology in identifying available manpower to remove fly-tipping would also help to remove any inefficiencies. Although village cleansing

service currently allows for 'tourist villages' there could potentially be further reductions made to services in off-season. Consideration should be given to utilising some of the time savings and redirecting this to increasing education / enforcement activities or for more income-generating opportunities. Village cleansing could be reduced significantly particularly in the winter months freeing up time for more education and/or enforcement work or for more income-generating activity.

- f) **assessment of current fleet and investigations into more efficient alternatives** – the street cleansing service uses the following vehicles:

Area	Large Sweeper	Medium Sweeper	Pedestrian Sweeper	Pick-up Vehicles/Vans
Caithness	1	0	0	0
Sutherland	1	0	1	1
R&C	1	0	1	6
Skye	1	0	0	3
Lochaber	1	1	0	1
Inverness	2	1	2	8
B&SN	2	0	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>

There are 4 large sweepers due for replacement in 2017/18, three in 2018/19, and two in 2019/20. These vehicles are all owned by Highland Council, and although the purchase of new fleet vehicles is currently budgeted for in the capital programme the decision to renew equipment can be delayed if required. Renewing plant equipment may bring revenue savings in terms of more efficient vehicle specifications, and less maintenance required in the near future. Electric sweepers are available, and have been considered by other Councils a few years ago. These were found to have break even whole life costs so there were no overall savings. The electric vehicle market has moved rapidly over the last few years and electric sweepers which deliver savings may now be available. There would be risk associated with this due to the new technology. The Energy Savings Trust has been approached in terms of potential funding to help cover the upfront costs with a response pending.

Converting diesel vehicles to hybrids which use LPG fuel has also been investigated. This is not appropriate in these circumstances as the mileage travelled by the vehicles is not sufficient to achieve a good return on investment.

There may be shared procurement benefits with the new arrangements with Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Councils, this could include the procurement of plant equipment and fuel. The plant equipment is relatively specialist and expensive, and a collaborative bid may help to reduce costs.

Set against a reducing budget and future potential budget pressures such as increased cost of fuel, the best way to try to maintain the basic level of performance may be through the use of mechanical sweeping equipment, with a reduction in other services which are more labour intensive such as litter collection "by hand", cleaning chewing gum, graffiti etc.

- g) **assessment of good practice and innovation elsewhere** – in rural locations where service can be reduced, use of technology could help provide a more responsive and reactive service which need not be carried out by street cleaning squad, but by other HC staff in the area eg roads or grounds maintenance teams. Bin sensors can be installed which send a signal when they are reaching capacity.

The 'Love Clean Streets' app (supported by Keep Scotland Beautiful) and [www.fixmystreet.com](http://www.fixmystreet.com) allows anyone to take a photo of litter, fly-tipping etc and submit it direct to the local authority. It is understood that such apps are currently not compatible with the HC CRM system and discussion also highlighted concerns around the effectiveness of the system with regard to street cleansing. This should be addressed as a matter of urgency. Greater promotion of the capability to report litter, fly-tipping etc via the Council's website should also be carried out.

Partnership working also offers potential for a more joined up approach. Ilfracombe Town Team has been developed with representatives of the community planning partners all being involved with the town centre environment. This includes all partners with a town presence (including police, fire, ambulance, harbour staff, volunteers and council) reporting or dealing with any issues noticed or reported to them by the public. Shared use of town centre facilities ensures more effective working and cost savings - eg the street sweeping vehicle is now garaged at the town centre fire station saving time and fuel in going to the depot for it.

Community activists can also have a strong role to play – Fort William Town Team is an energetic group of around 30-40 volunteers who clean, litter pick, paint, weed and plant throughout the Town Centre ensuring the town always looks well-cared for. This model (which arose from the Town Centre Charrette process) could be encouraged elsewhere.

Enfield Council has had a marked success by introducing Tidy Teams where squads of four men (instead of the usual one or two) have been able to 'deep clean' larger areas with complaints dropping by 77% during the pilot period. It has been based on the principle that people are less likely to litter a clean area and has freed up time to then provide a faster reactive service.

Southampton Council has also greatly decreased complaints by reducing service particularly to outlying areas (reduced to almost every two months in some places) but providing a much faster reaction time to complaints using mobile technology.

City of London has had success by introducing very targeted campaigns. Smoking litter was reduced by 46% with its 'no small problem' campaign and a 'vomit patrol' reduced anti-social behaviour residue by 39%.

#### **4.0 EDUCATION**

**4.1** Increased education is strongly supported by Citizens' Panel respondents. There is a clear need to educate, prevent and instigate culture change to demonstrate that dropping litter is socially unacceptable. Delivery of an annual spring clean event combining community walkabouts (to include business sector) with community spring cleans to 'blitz' litter would help to highlight the extent of the problem. Such an event could be developed as a spend to save and could utilise events and waste officers. This should be a joint event with the Highland Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) to work with their membership.

**4.2** More work with schools should be carried out to reinforce that it is unacceptable to drop litter. This could be included as part of the P7 – High School induction process with pupils (and parents?) being asked to sign a pledge not to drop litter. Novel ideas such as 'distance to next bin' posters can be used on the school lunch-time route and more use of teaching staff to occasionally 'monitor' children outwith school grounds would potentially help.

A theoretical participatory budgeting scenario could be used where children could see what else could be provided if the Council did not need to spend so much on picking up litter.

#### **5.0 ENFORCEMENT**

**5.1** Increased enforcement is also strongly supported by both the Inverness BID and Citizens' Panel respondents. Unfortunately, the previous enforcement mechanisms of Litter Abatement Notices

and Street Litter Control Notices were repealed by UK Government and in error extended to Scotland. This only leaves:

- a) Fixed Penalty Notices – these can be issued by the Local Authority to individuals who have been seen dropping litter;
- b) Warnings to Young People – the Code allows for warning letters to be sent to the Parents or Guardians of young people under the age of 16 who have been seen dropping litter; and
- c) Waste Contracts – the Local Authority can inspect businesses to check that an appropriate waste contract is in place (this check can go back 2 years). If there is no contract in place (or if there is no proof of a contract) a penalty of £380 can be imposed. Greater enforcement would reduce the incidence of businesses using street litter bins to dispose of waste.

There is potential for community volunteers, members of businesses etc to be trained to help them identify any offence and to help them understand how hard it can be to actually witness an offence. They can help to become the “eyes and ears” of communities by reporting litter fouling, fly tipping etc saving staff time on responding to an issue which may not be an offence.

In addition, training could be carried out with street cleansing (and potentially other Council staff) to be ‘witnesses’ to littering, providing them with the confidence to ‘gently’ challenge the behaviour but without being able to issue FPN.

Also with appropriate staff training, costs could be saved by training the staff who recover fly-tipping to look for and preserve evidence, passing it to Enforcement on every occasion (rather than a separate trip for enforcement officers). This also helps to avoid incidences where fly-tipping is recovered before any investigation is possible. It would also help to log the location of every fly tipping found in order to develop strategies to stop further tipping in each area and the strategy can then be unique to areas or communities.

## **6.0 INCOME GENERATION**

**6.1** Some opportunities for income generation have been identified and more importantly some have the anticipated benefits of reducing litter. Income generated could be targeted towards provision of better education.

a) Sponsorship - Adopt a Highway - Adopt a Highway schemes have proved extremely successful in many US states. Under these schemes businesses, charities, community groups, or individuals/ families can adopt a stretch of road and pay for an enhanced cleaning service. Businesses are attracted to this scheme as it is a form of cheap advertising, and also shows corporate social responsibility in their local community. Some community groups adopt stretches of road and provide the service themselves (e.g. scouts conducting frequent litter picks).

Sponsorship could also be sought for new vehicles, and this could be tied in with a marketing campaign (e.g. Oldham Council asking for public suggestions on naming a new gritter).

b) Use of street waste bins as ‘hoardings’ – space on bins could be sold but would require planning consent and have to be professionally delivered to avoid any encouragement of fly-posting.

c) Provision of services to other land-owners (both public and private sector) – this could include clearance of fly-tipping and gum-removal.

**7.0 WHAT SHOULD BE STOPPED** – due to the statutory nature of the street cleansing function it is difficult to identify activities which can be completely stopped. However graffiti removal and leaf collection are not statutory activities (although leaf collection can run into a health and safety issue given that failure to remove leaves can create slippery pavements). Within its Business Plan, the Inverness BID identifies removal of graffiti as one of its functions (and the removal of fly-posting). However, in discussion it is apparent that this only relates to that which is easily removed.

While not taking up a significant amount of street-cleansing time, these activities could be carried out by others – in Lochaber a very successful model exists for the removal of graffiti by Criminal Justice and this could be replicated in the City and other areas of Highland.

Trunk roads – it appears to be no more than a throwback to previous management arrangements that sees local authorities being burdened with removal of litter from trunk roads. The Council should consider lobbying Transport Scotland to have this changed to preferably see litter removal being incorporated into the trunk road operating company contract or at the very least the local authority being paid for the service.

Bottle banks – closer supervision of the bottle bank companies who remove / replace the banks would reduce the amount of time spent by street cleansing in clearing up around them, freeing up time for other enforcement / commercial activity. However, there can be a significant amount of non-glass litter left at these sites eg bags and boxes which the bottle bank companies would not be responsible for.

## **8.0 IMPLICATIONS**

**8.1 Resources** - the resource implications for each option are summarised at section 9 below and at Appendix 2. Implementation of some of the recommendations have the potential for cost-savings – staff reductions could save £27,750 per job and around £27,000 has been identified from overtime savings. Deletion of posts currently being held vacant is also considered preferable to making staff redundant. A change to Terms and Conditions reducing the working week by two hours could achieve a saving of £97,000. It should be noted that the GMB has been represented on the group and this proposal does cause concern in terms of impacts on lower paid staff. *However it should also be noted that if the working week of all HC staff was to be cut by two hours there would be a substantial saving to the Council's wage bill.* Other proposals such as utilisation of technology and awareness raising events would have a small revenue cost but these would constitute 'spend to save' activities. Potential income of around £15,000 pa has been identified. Overall there are no anticipated cost increases.

**8.2 Legal** – Street cleansing is a statutory function and therefore there is a legal requirement to maintain the service. The proposals contained within the report may result in a reduction in the standard of cleanliness but it is not proposed to reduce this to such an extent that the statutory liability is no longer being met. Any proposed change to terms and conditions will require to be properly consulted on with staff and trade unions.

**8.3 Equalities** – screening has identified that negative implications arise from some of these proposals. Disabled people report a higher level of dissatisfaction with street cleansing and this is likely to be exacerbated by any reduction in standards – this could be mitigated by community involvement in eg litterpicks and a reduction in littering. **Poverty** - reduction in job numbers / length of the working week will impact on household incomes and reduce opportunities for employment. In addition SIMD areas are more likely to experience high volumes of littering which is likely to reduce social, economic and environmental confidence.

**8.4 Climate Change/ Carbon Clever** – use of electric vehicles is being considered and would have a positive impact on the environment. However at time of writing this is to be further investigated.

- 8.5 Risk** – the major risk lies with the likely reduction in street cleanliness which could potentially have a negative impact on how communities and visitors feel about their environment. This can be mitigated to an extent by increased education and enforcement, reinforcing the message that dropping litter is socially and environmentally unacceptable
- 8.6 Gaelic** – there are no Gaelic implications from the proposals
- 8.7 Rural** – it is likely that with reducing resources the focus of street cleansing will be on the high-amenity areas including city / town centres and rural ‘tourist destinations’. Impact on other areas can be mitigated to an extent by increased education and enforcement, but also by working in partnership with communities to develop local solutions and through the use of technology.

## **9.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 9.1** The process undertaken by the Review Team has met the requirements of the Redesign Board, has been wide-ranging, has considered good practice and innovation and has considered the affordability challenges currently facing the Council.

Further it has considered these under the ten options for service delivery promoted by the Redesign Board – these are set out at **Appendix 2** alongside estimated cost savings and potential for income generation. Within the short timeframe of the review it has not been possible to look at new routes, removal of overtime, shift patterns etc which will reduce expenditure but this will be done as a matter of urgency.

- 9.2** Noting the wide range of activities set out at Appendix 2, the following recommendations are made:

- a) That Members consider the following actions prior to implementation:
- i) Job reductions / removal of vacant posts – this would provide the quickest cost-savings but will be at the expense of dropping cleanliness grades and failing to meet cleanliness standards. Each job lost would ‘save’ £27,750 (including on-costs); Deletion of posts currently being held vacant is also considered preferable to making staff redundant.
  - ii) review of terms and conditions – by reducing the working week by two hours ie from a 37 to 35 hour working week would save £97,000 and have a less significant impact on cleanliness. However this proposal would need to be the subject of considerable consultation *and consideration should be given to rolling this out across all HC staff.*
  - iii) lobbying to remove the burden of litter-picking from trunk roads, transferring it to the trunk road operator. If successful this would have a positive impact on street cleansing, freeing up resources
- b) that the following actions are taken forward as an operational matter within the service within the next financial year:
- i) reduce overtime payments - would save £27,000 but would result in reduced service in Inverness, Lochaber and Caithness
  - ii) investigate improved use of mobile technology to allow better route management and a more efficient response to complaints of eg fly-tipping – *to liaise with waste management*



- iii) work with the Energy Savings Trust to develop a business case for electric fleet vehicles and to identify potential sources of funding.
  - iv) develop a draft Highland Litter Strategy (for approval by Committee) which will reflect national guidance but tailored to fit the unique geography of Highland. Such a plan would include: maps / zones, standards of cleanliness, complaints procedure, enforcement etc. It is expected that after approval of the Strategy, that the following activities will be taken forward: more education, including events highlighting the environmental and social impacts of dropping litter and the cost of its removal; more work with the business sector to encourage businesses to take responsibility for litter generated from their activity; more work with partners, communities and environmental groups to develop more local solutions; more short-term targeted campaigns eg anti-smoking litter etc; more enforcement, including training of additional Council officers to issue Fixed Penalty Notices and more stringent checking of waste contracts
- c) that the following actions are taken forward as an operational matter and with support from other Services:
- i) investigate the income-generating opportunities highlighted at paragraph 6.1;
  - ii) instigate a LEAN review of street cleansing;
  - iii) an urgent review of the current CRM system is required to see how it can be improved to deliver a more effective response to complaints etc and to ensure it is fit for purpose from the customers point of view.

## APPENDIX 1

1.0	<b>Legislative Responsibility</b>
1.1	Code of practice on Litter and Refuse, section 89 of Environmental Protection Act 1990.
1.2	Duty - to keep land and highways clear of litter; the code of practice provides guidance on the discharge of the duties under section 89 by establishing reasonable and generally acceptable standards of cleanliness which a local authority (those under the duty) should be capable of meeting.
2.0	<b>Overview</b>

2.1	Waste Management took on responsibility for street cleaning operation in September 2012.
2.2	The service was transferred with a £350k reduction from the 2013/14 budget. This was achieved by the deletion of 14 FTE vacant posts.
2.3	<p>The operation of street cleansing extends to and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manual litter collection</li> <li>• Manual sweeping</li> <li>• Removal of dog fouling</li> <li>• Fly-tipping removal</li> <li>• Dead animals</li> <li>• Litter Bins</li> <li>• Dog Bins</li> <li>• Leaf collection</li> <li>• Mechanical sweeping of footways</li> <li>• Mechanical sweeping of roadways</li> <li>• Road verge litter collection</li> <li>• Chewing Gum removal</li> <li>• Graffiti Removal</li> </ul>
2.4	<p><b>Other Duties</b> Street Cleansing staff provide cover for waste collection and recycling centre duties. In addition during the winter period street cleansing staff are utilised for footway gritting and snow clearance.</p> <p>Mechanical sweeping vehicles and street cleaning drivers are used to provide support to roads surface dressing program.</p>
3.0	<b>Existing Staffing resource</b>
3.1	<p><b>Caithness</b> Wick - 4 x HC 2, 1 X HC4 Thurso – 2 x HC2, 1 X HC4 Total Posts - 8</p> <p>Staff also provide cover for waste collection operations</p>
3.2	<p><b>Sutherland</b> Brora - 1 x HC2 Helmsdale – 1 HC2</p> <p>Total Posts 2</p>
3.3	<p><b>Ross and Cromarty</b> Dingwall - 4 x HC3, 1 x HC6 (Foreman) Cromarty – 1 x HC3 Muir of Ord 1 x HC3 Fortrose – 1 x HC3</p> <p>Alness – 1 X HC4 1 x HC2, 1 X HC3 Tain - 1 x HC 2, 4 x HC3 Invergordon – 1 x HC3</p> <p>Total Posts 17 Staff also provide cover for waste collection operations</p>

3.4	<b>Skye and Lochalsh</b> Broadford – 1 x HC 4, 2 x HC3 Portree - 3 x HC3  Total Posts – 6																																																	
3.5	<b>Lochaber</b> Fort William - 1 x HC 2, 3 x HC 3, 2 x HC4 Mallaig - 1 x HC3 Kinlochleven – 0.4 x HC2  Total Posts 7.4																																																	
3.6	<b>Inverness</b> HC 2 x 10 HC 3 x 5 HC 4 x 12 HC 6 x 1 (Foreman)  Total Posts 28																																																	
3.7	<b>B&amp;SN</b> Kingussie – 1 x HC3 Aviemore – 1 x HC3 Grantown – 1 x HC3 Nairn – 2 x HC 3, 1 x HC4  Total Posts 6																																																	
4.0	<b>Plant</b>																																																	
4.1	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Large Sweeper</th> <th>Medium Sweeper</th> <th>Pedestrian Sweeper</th> <th>Pick-up Vehicles/Vans</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Caithness</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sutherland</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R&amp;C</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skye</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lochaber</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inverness</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B&amp;SN</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Totals</b></td> <td><b>9</b></td> <td><b>2</b></td> <td><b>4</b></td> <td><b>20</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Area	Large Sweeper	Medium Sweeper	Pedestrian Sweeper	Pick-up Vehicles/Vans	Caithness	1	0	0	0	Sutherland	1	0	1	1	R&C	1	0	1	6	Skye	1	0	0	3	Lochaber	1	1	0	1	Inverness	2	1	2	8	B&SN	2	0	0	1	<b>Totals</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>				
Area	Large Sweeper	Medium Sweeper	Pedestrian Sweeper	Pick-up Vehicles/Vans																																														
Caithness	1	0	0	0																																														
Sutherland	1	0	1	1																																														
R&C	1	0	1	6																																														
Skye	1	0	0	3																																														
Lochaber	1	1	0	1																																														
Inverness	2	1	2	8																																														
B&SN	2	0	0	1																																														
<b>Totals</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>																																														
5.0	<b>Finance</b>																																																	
5.1	<b>Area Budgets</b> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Budget</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Caithness</td> <td>314 (k)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sutherland</td> <td>301.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R&amp;C</td> <td>532</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skye</td> <td>176.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lochaber</td> <td>276</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inverness</td> <td>993.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B&amp;SN</td> <td>419.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HQ</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>£3,029,000</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Area	Budget	Caithness	314 (k)	Sutherland	301.9	R&C	532	Skye	176.5	Lochaber	276	Inverness	993.8	B&SN	419.8	HQ	15	<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,029,000</b>																									
Area	Budget																																																	
Caithness	314 (k)																																																	
Sutherland	301.9																																																	
R&C	532																																																	
Skye	176.5																																																	
Lochaber	276																																																	
Inverness	993.8																																																	
B&SN	419.8																																																	
HQ	15																																																	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,029,000</b>																																																	

6.0	<b>Additional Saving</b>
6.1	In 2015/16, a saving of £66k was achieved by the removal of 2 mechanical sweeping vehicles from the Sutherland area.

OPTIONS AS SET OUT IN REVIEW PROCESS	ID	OPTIONS	COST SAVING / INCOME GENERATION
<b>In-house Services</b>			
Little room for savings based on current working model – need more detailed breakdown of labour headings	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate + cost new shift patterns which remove / reduce OT payments</li> </ul>	<b>£27,000</b>
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change terms and conditions to reduce week from 37 to 35 hour week – <i>substantial savings would be made if a two-hour reduction was implemented for all HC staff</i></li> </ul>	<b>£97,000</b>
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job reductions – each job lost achieves an average saving of £27,750 (including on-costs) but impacts on cleanliness. Deletion of posts currently being held vacant is also considered preferable to making staff redundant.</li> </ul>	<b>£27,750 per post</b>
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilise technology to increase efficient of routes</li> </ul>	?
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vehicle innovation – requires to be a spend to save but possibly limited return. Energy Saving Trust have been approached about potential funding.</li> </ul>	?
<b>Commercial opportunities to raise income</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use litter bins as opportunities for commercial adverts / sponsorship ? <b>50 bins x £100 pa (estimate – to be tested)</b></li> <li>Uniforms to be ‘sponsored’? – <b>20 st cl x £100 pa (estimate – to be tested)</b></li> <li>Sponsorship of streets - <b>4 x £500 (estimate – to be tested) – cost of enhanced cleaning would increase but paid for by sponsorship - therefore improvement would be in street cleanliness, not income generation.</b></li> <li>Gum machine + operative could be hired out – identify likely rate – <i>£250 per day x 25</i></li> <li>Offer fly-tipping clean ups to private land-owners - <i>£250 per clean-up x 15</i></li> </ul>	<b>£5,000 ?</b>  <b>£2,000 ?</b> nil (but improved environment)  <b>£6,250 ?</b> <b>£3,750 ?</b>
<b>Reduce need for service through enforcement</b>	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More rigorous enforcement through more use of Fixed Penalty Notices and greater scrutiny on businesses waste contracts (which directly impacts on street cleansing) - noting any income from fines should return to street cleansing. <i>Potential for a spend to save – increased enforcement could also be carried out by parking wardens and existing trained street cleansing team.</i></li> </ul>	<i>To be considered as part of a Highland-wide litter strategy</i>
<b>Reduce need for service through</b>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to educate / prevent and instigate culture change. Dropping litter to become socially</li> </ul>	<b>Either spend</b>

<b>education</b>		unacceptable. Design annual spring clean event combining community walkabouts (to include business sector) with community spring cleans to 'blitz' litter and highlight extent of problem – develop event as a spend to save – could utilise events officer + waste officers.	<b>to save or attract sponsorship - To be considered as part of a Highland-wide litter strategy</b>
<b>Services delivered in Partnership and integrated services</b>	<b>9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate other models eg Ilfracombe Town Team – multi-agency / community response between all partners operating in Town Centre eg fire station used as base for street-sweeping</li> </ul>	<b>To be considered as part of a Highland-wide litter strategy</b>
<b>Shared services</b>	<b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are there opportunities for better fuel pricing by joint procurement with Aberdeen / Aberdeenshire</li> </ul>	<b>tbc</b>
<b>Community-run Services</b>	<b>11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to ask communities to deliver service – we reduce service to a minimum standard</li> <li>Introduce spring / summer walkabout with community reps to identify problem areas</li> <li>Option of a cleaning operative leading a community blitz?</li> <li>Communities being asked to inspect /report when street cleansing required</li> <li>Community rep could be used to monitor when bins are full – if black bags are used community (or other HC staff) could empty and store locally eg CS compound</li> </ul>	<b>To be considered as part of a Highland-wide litter strategy</b>
<b>Opportunities for place-based approaches with partners</b>	<b>12</b>	Could we deliver for other public agencies – Forestry Commission, Scottish Canals – potential for income generation	<b>To be investigated</b>
<b>Stopping services</b>	<b>13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stop non-statutory elements –graffiti, fly-posting. Removal of leaves may continue to be required under H &amp; S</li> <li>Lobby at national level for responsibility for trunk road litter to transfer to trunk road operating company</li> </ul>	

## Citizens' Panel Survey 2016

## Street Cleaning – Initial Feedback

*Cleaning our streets*

Which areas should we focus our resource on?

Table 1: based on 807 respondents

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Rating Average
Cleaning up in town and city centres after night time activity	24%	26%	20%	8%	8%	5%	2.73
Cleaning up around secondary schools after lunch times	5%	6%	11%	19%	26%	34%	4.58
Cleaning up in tourist areas	22%	36%	23%	9%	6%	3%	2.49
Cleaning up at the edges of roads	6%	16%	25%	27%	19%	7%	3.57
Removing chewing gum from streets	2%	6%	11%	18%	29%	34%	4.68
Enforcement activity, e.g. fines	47%	10%	12%	10%	8%	14%	2.62

Other suggestions include:

- Education – focus on education in schools and making schools responsible for their own area
- General education to the public
- Providing more bins
- Individuals on community service providing a service
- Some support for fines – for individuals, schools, supermarkets and take-aways

In our city and town centres to what extent do you agree that business in these areas should be asked to contribute more by:

*Preventing littering*

Table 2: based on 854 respondents

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>61%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>

*Paying more for the service*

Table 3: based on 853 respondents

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
41%	34%	16%	7%	2%

*Cleaning up more around their premises*

Table 4: based on 846 respondents

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
64%	30%	3%	1%	1%

**Enforcement**

To what extent would you support a greater focus on enforcement action?

Table 5: based on 853 respondents

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
70%	25%	4%	0.5%	0.5%

**Community Role**

Would you be willing to be involved with a community group to regularly keep your community clean?

Table 6: based on 846 respondents

Yes	<input type="text" value="33%"/>	No	<input type="text" value="36%"/>	Don't Know	<input type="text" value="31%"/>
-----	----------------------------------	----	----------------------------------	------------	----------------------------------

If you answered yes, what role or roles would you be interested in? Tick all that apply:

Table 7: based on 328 respondents

Volunteering to pick up litter	<input type="text" value="59%"/>
Coordinating a local group to pick up litter	<input type="text" value="7%"/>
Promoting responsible and clean behaviour	<input type="text" value="34%"/>

And what support would be helpful from the Council?

Table 8: based on 392 respondents

Litter picking equipment	<input type="text" value="75%"/>
Advice and training e.g. health and safety	<input type="text" value="43%"/>
Staff support time	<input type="text" value="23%"/>
Access to small grants to support litter picking	<input type="text" value="39%"/>

*(multiple responses so don't total to 100%)*

If you answered no, please tell us your reasons.



Table 9: based on 402 respondents

Lack of time	37%	Family commitments	21%
No volunteering opportunities locally	6%	No volunteering opportunities that I'm interested in	5%
Work commitments	27%	Health reasons	41%
Do not want to	17%	Disclosure requirements	2%

*(multiple responses so don't total to 100%)*

Do you have any additional comments on how to prevent littering or to reduce the amount it costs to clean up litter in the Highlands?

295 comments were received in response to this question.

Key areas that were noted by respondents to prevent littering include:

- Education: A considerable number of respondents (46) highlighted that education was key to prevent littering. Respondents highlighted that schools should take a role in teaching children to take care of the area they live. One respondent noted that they were disappointed that the Highland Council countryside ranger team was under threat as they have a key role in teaching young people about the outside environment.
- Penalties/enforcement: A number of respondents commented that there should be a more proactive and strict penalties and enforcement policy. A number of respondents suggested that repeat offenders are publicised.
- Campaign/behaviour change
- More bins: Respondents highlighted that having bins at benches, laybys and bus stops would prevent people from littering.

Key areas that were highlighted to reduce the amount it costs to clean up litter in the Highlands include:

- School litter picks
- Support local community to be able to do it themselves
- Using workers who are subject to community pay back orders

### **Overview**

The survey was distributed to 2,346 members of the Citizens' Panel. The panel were given two weeks to respond, with the deadline for responses the 23 December 2016. 877 responses were received – 380 electronically and 497 in paper – providing a response rate of 37%. This is lower than previous surveys, which normally receive a response rate of around

44% but is reflective of the time of year and the necessary, but short, timescale for response. A profile of respondents can be found below.

### Gender

452 respondents were females (51%), 382 respondents were male (44%) and 43 respondents chose not to disclose their gender (5%).

### Age

Table 1.1 based on 834 respondents

Response	Number	%
16-17	2	0.2
18-24	24	2.8
25-34	25	3
35-44	64	7.7
45-54	129	15.4
55-64	219	22.2
65-74	249	29.8
75 +	122	14.6

From the respondents who disclosed their age: 2 respondents were aged 16-17 , 24 respondents were aged 18 - 24, 25 respondents were aged 25 – 34, 64 respondents were aged 35 - 44 (7.7 %) 129 respondents were aged 45 - 54 , 219 respondents were aged 55 – 64 (22.2%), 249 respondents were aged 65 – 74, 122 respondents were over 75.

### How long have you lived in The Highland Council area?

Table 1.2 based on 828 respondents

Response	Number	%
Less than 3 years	7	0.9
3-5 years	19	2.2
5-10 years	64	8
Over 10 years	735	88.8

### Which of these best applies to you?

Table 1.3 based on 839 respondents

Response	Number	%
Working for a single employer full-time	205	24.4
Working for a single employer part-time	83	9.9
Working for more than one employer	17	2
Self-employed	86	10.2
Unable to work - long-term sickness	11	1.3
Unemployed	7	0.8
Retired	376	44.8
Looking after the home or family	19	2.2
In full-time education	10	1.2
Unable to work - disability	14	1.7
Carer	11	1.3

### Which of the following best describes your current housing situation?

Table 1.4 based on 833 respondents

Response	Number	%
Own home/ mortgage	715	85.8
Rent from a housing association	13	1.6

Rent from The Council	32	3.8
House comes with job	9	1.1
Private rented	34	4.1
Living with parents	30	3.6

### Disability

114 of 822 respondents (13.9%) indicated that they have a disability (i.e. a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term adverse effect upon their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities).

### Families with children – Are there school age children in your household?

125 of the 800 respondents (15.6%) indicated that they have school age children in their household.

### Ethnicity

Table 1.5 based on 830 respondents

Response	Number	%
White – Scottish	603	72.65
White – Other British	181	21.81
White – Irish	3	0.36
White – Polish	4	0.48
White – Other	26	3.13
Pakistani, Pakistani Scottish or Pakistani British	1	0.12
Indian, Indian Scottish or Indian British	4	0.48
Chinese, Chinese Scottish or Chinese British	3	0.36
African, African Scottish or African British	1	0.12
Caribbean, Caribbean Scottish or Caribbean British	1	0.12
Black, Black Scottish or Black British	2	0.24
Arab, Arab Scottish or Arab British	1	0.12

### Location

Table 1.6 based on 750 respondents

Response	Number	%
North, West and Central Sutherland	22	2.9
Thurso	24	3.2
Wick	19	2.5
Landward Caithness	33	4.4
East Sutherland	25	3.3

Wester Ross, Strathpeffer and Lochalsh	45	6.0
Cromarty Firth	27	3.6
Tain and Easter Ross	30	4.0
Dingwall and Seaforth	38	5.1
Black Isle	47	6.3
Eilean a' Che	42	5.6
Caol and Mallaig	17	2.3
Aird and Loch Ness	41	5.5
Inverness West	34	4.5
Inverness Central	30	4.0
Inverness Ness-side	31	4.1
Inverness Millburn	36	4.8
Culloden and Ardersier	45	6.0
Nairn	45	6.0
Inverness South	49	6.5
Badenoch and Strathspey	36	4.8
Fort William and Ardnamurchan	34	4.5