

Vibrant and Sustainable City Scrutiny Panel

14 April 2016

Time 6.00 pm **Public Meeting?** YES **Type of meeting** Scrutiny
Venue Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre, St Peter's Square, Wolverhampton WV1 1SH

Membership

Chair Cllr Ian Angus (Lab)
Vice-chair Cllr Christopher Haynes (Con)

Labour

Cllr Mary Bateman
Cllr Philip Bateman
Cllr Val Evans
Cllr Bhupinder Gakhal
Cllr Keith Inston
Cllr Lynne Moran
Cllr John Rowley
Cllr Caroline Siarkiewicz

Conservative

Cllr Andrew Wynne

Liberal Democrat

UKIP

Cllr Malcolm Gwinnett

Quorum for this meeting is three Councillors.

Information for the Public

If you have any queries about this meeting, please contact the democratic support team:

Contact Earl Piggott-Smith
Tel/Email Tel: 01902 551251 or earl.piggott-smith@wolverhampton.gov.uk
Address Democratic Support, Civic Centre, 1st floor, St Peter's Square,
Wolverhampton WV1 1RL

Copies of other agendas and reports are available from:

Website <http://wolverhampton.cmis.uk.com/decisionmaking>
Email democratic.support@wolverhampton.gov.uk
Tel 01902 555043

Please take note of the protocol for filming, recording, and use of social media in meetings, copies of which are displayed in the meeting room.

Some items are discussed in private because of their confidential or commercial nature. These reports are not available to the public.

Agenda

Part 1 – items open to the press and public

Item No. *Title*

MEETING BUSINESS ITEMS

- 1 **Apologies**
- 2 **Declarations of interest**
- 3 **Minutes of the previous meeting (11.2.16)** (Pages 3 - 10)
[To approve the minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record]
- 4 **Matters arising**
[To consider any matter arising from the minutes]

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 5 **Keeping the City clean** (Pages 11 - 18)
[Ross Cook, Service Director – City Environment, Place, to present a report on the range of actions being taken to keep the City clean.]

Vibrant and Sustainable City Scrutiny Panel

Minutes - 11 February 2016

Attendance

Members of the Vibrant and Sustainable City Scrutiny Panel

Cllr Mary Bateman
Cllr Philip Bateman
Cllr Val Evans
Cllr Bhupinder Gakhal
Cllr Christopher Haynes (Chair)
Cllr Keith Inston
Cllr Lynne Moran
Cllr Caroline Siarkiewicz
Cllr Andrew Wynne

Employees

Richard Phillips	Solicitor/Senior Solicitor
Earl Piggott-Smith	Scrutiny Officer
Mila Simpson	Section Leader, Housing Strategy
Chris Hale	Head of Housing
Lesley Roberts	Strategic Director of Housing
William Humphries	Service Lead, Environmental Health

In attendance

Cllr Steve Evans	Cabinet Member for City Environment
Mark Henderson	Director of Housing, Wolverhampton Homes

Part 1 – items open to the press and public

Item No. *Title*

- 1 Chair Announcement**
In the absence of the Chair Cllr Ian Angus the meeting was chaired by Cllr Christopher Haynes.
- 2 Apologies**
Apologies were received from the following member(s) of the panel:

Cllr Ian Angus
- 3 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

4 **Minutes of the previous meeting (3.12.15)**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 3.12.15 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5 **Matters arising**

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

6 **Review of Age Designations on Council Flats**

Mila Simpson, Section Leader, Housing Strategy, introduced the report and gave a brief overview of the key elements of the proposal to review age designations for allocating Council flats. Section Leader explained that the report was being presented to the panel for pre-decision scrutiny. The report will be presented to Cabinet on 23.3.16 for their consideration and approval.

Section Leader explained that a review of the age designation policy that sits within the Council's housing allocations policy had identified a number of issues with properties that have an age designation applied to them. For example, the current policy had a detrimental impact on families with children, particularly single parent households, who are unable to access age designated flats because they did not meet the criteria.

Section Leader also explained that the age designation policy did not apply to leaseholders living in blocks and they could choose to sell the property to anyone, thereby undermining the policy.

Section Leader explained that age designations of Council flats made it difficult to let some properties due to lower demand and as a consequence properties had been allocated to applicants with a lower housing priority. Section Leader commented that the proposed policy change was intended to make best use of the Council's housing stock.

The panel queried the potential increase in the number of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) cases arising from intergenerational living. Section Leader outlined a series of activities aimed at minimising the likelihood of this happening. This includes the tenancy checks done to prevent future difficulties when allocating properties to new tenants. In addition, pre-tenancy work is done with successful applicants to explain their responsibilities and the action that can be taken in response in complaints about their behaviour. Section Leader added that housing managers will also monitor tenancy issues in designated flats and deal with them accordingly.

The panel accepted the need to make the best use of limited housing stock in order to meet demand for affordable housing. The panel did express concern about the proposal to mix older and younger tenants in the same block of flats, which could lead to nuisance complaints. Section Leader explained that in addition to other options, there is a mediation service available to deal with issues that may arise.

The panel discussed the current age profile of tenants currently living in age designated properties and how this would be affected by the proposed changes to minimum age. Section Leader explained that the majority of blocks where it is

recommended that age designations are removed are currently restricted to people aged 30 or over.

Former sheltered blocks are currently restricted to people aged 50. The vast majority of these would retain an age designation of over 50 years if the proposal was approved by Cabinet.

The panel commented that they understood the need to make more flexible use of current housing stock. The panel commented that the plans were likely to raise concerns among the public and it was important that the community likely to be affected understood the reasons behind the proposed changes.

The panel commented on the importance of having an effective communication strategy to explain the plans and continually reassure existing tenants.

The panel discussed the impact of leasehold properties in age designated blocks on the policy and the creation of mixed communities.

The panel queried the small numbers of the people who responded to the consultation – 23 responses were received to letters sent to 2295 households affected by proposed change. Section Leader commented on the work done to encourage tenants to provide feedback on the proposals. The panel queried what work has been done to communicate the message about the proposals. Service Lead explained the work done to keep residents informed about the changes.

The panel discussed the need to provide residents with regular information about the progress of the plans, particularly for people who are not comfortable using online sources. The panel commented that a communication plan should be prepared and shared with Councillors who would be affected by the proposed changes.

Mark Henderson, Director of Housing, Wolverhampton Homes explained that a citywide ASB service managed by Wolverhampton Homes has increased the effectiveness of responding to such complaints.

Director of Housing responded to comments about the issue of ASB. Director of Housing supported the comments of the Section Leader in relation to pre tenancy work. Director of Housing commented on the ability of the service to develop plans following the formation of a single cross tenure ASB Team based around electoral wards. Director of Housing explained that the ASB team can deal with a mixed population in the future.

Section Leader commented on work done to respond to concerns about ASB and the use of mediation officer to intervene where needed.

Service Lead commented that the review had been undertaken to address the housing needs of an ageing population in the future. Service Lead explained the range of work being done to address these needs.

Cllr Steve Evans, Cabinet Member for City Environment, commented that public confidence in the ASB team was a key part of efforts to reassure the public who may have concerns about the proposal.

Cabinet Member for City Environment commented on the changes made following a review to the previous structure which led to the creation of a single team and number to deal with ASB queries. Cabinet Member for City Environment commented that many people already live in mixed communities with people of different ages, and this has not led to the problems highlighted as concerns by Councillors.

Section Leader agreed to further look at comments received from the public to the proposals.

Resolved:

The panel agreed to receive details of interim public communication plan to tenants covering the period from publication to the date it will be considered by Cabinet. The panel comments on the report to be included as an appendix to the report presented to Cabinet.

The majority of the panel accepted the recommendations.

Cllrs Haynes and Wynne wanted it recorded that they rejected the proposal to remove age discrimination across those properties affected.

7 **Taking Forward the Management of the City Centre Public Realm - briefing paper**

William Humphries, Service Lead, Environmental Health, introduced the briefing paper and explained that the title should have been city centre regulation to better reflect the focus of the work. Service Lead explained that the title of future reports to the panel on this topic would be changed accordingly.

Service Lead explained the reasons for wanting to update the panel on this issue and to highlight the difficulty in finding long term solutions that would mitigate the impact of the issues detailed in the briefing paper.

Service Lead explained that the issues need to be considered in the context of Government attempts to deal with specific nuisance problems in a specified area through new powers detailed in ASB Crime and Behaviour Act 2014. Service Lead explained that the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) was aimed at stopping individuals or groups committing anti-social behaviour in public spaces. Service Lead gave examples of local authorities seeking to use the PSPO who failed to get public to support the proposal when they were consulted about the plan to restrict a specific activity. A breach of the order could lead to number of escalating scale of action.

Service Lead explained that the power has been not as successful as was hoped when first published and Councils were looking at other options to mitigate the issues such as begging, busking and street preaching which has been identified from complaints received as an issue. Service Lead explained in further detail the reasons for including the issues listed in the paper as being a priority for action. Service Lead gave a summary of the current and future action planned to deliver the necessary improvements.

Service Director commented on the issue of commercial bins stored on the highway and the problems caused by some city centre businesses not having a secure

location and space and options being considered, for example, bin sharing or storing bins in an agreed secure location.

The panel commented that it was difficult to reach a view about the suitability of the proposed responses to the issues listed without information about the size of the problem, for example, what proportion of business in the city centre place their commercial bins on public highways?

The panel queried the potential to use Council planning control powers to restrict and or mitigate the problems caused by commercial bins. Service Lead commented that some businesses were located in premises that could not be used to store bins due to the limited size available.

The panel discussed the issue of begging in the city centre and there was concern that the police were reluctant to use their powers to deal with this issue or intervene when they see instances. Service Lead explained the work being done to provide services to encourage people to use alternatives. Service Lead commented that a night shelter for homeless people will be opening shortly in Wolverhampton. However, based on past experience some homeless people may be unwilling to accept the offer due to the restrictions that apply to people who stay there.

Service Lead explained that a defence that has been used by people accused of begging was that there were offered money by a member of the public and did not ask for help.

Service Lead explained that the Vagrancy Act 1824 allows beggars to be fined. However, in practice the courts were unlikely to impose a fine which they would be unlikely to be able to pay. Service Lead explained the work being done to encourage public to give money to charities rather than directly to beggars. The scheme would involve collection boxes being made available in city centre shops. Service Lead accepted the difficult in finding a solution to the issue of begging but argued the need think of different ways of addressing the problem.

Cabinet Member for City Environment commented that the current policy towards begging will be reviewed in 2017 but was open to the idea of using the current civil enforcement team as part of multi approach to mitigating the effects of issues which cause a nuisance.

Cabinet Member commented on the idea of developing a code of practice for buskers to deal with nuisance issues in the city centre, but such a plan would depend on getting agreement and also there were practical problems in enforcing statutory nuisance provisions. Service Lead commented on the number of complaints received from city centre businesses about noise levels which they consider is having a negative effect on efforts to make the area more attractive to shoppers and visitors.

The panel discussed the issue of the impact of begging on city centre businesses and commented on the need to recognise that people may be in genuine need and experiencing hardship.

A panel member commented that the experience from other cities such as Oxford suggesting that begging in the city centre does not affect the number of tourists wanting to visit.

The panel discussed the issue of street preaching and their use of loud hailers which had received complaints from both members of the public and businesses about the nuisance caused.

The panel welcomed the report.

Resolved:

The panel to receive a progress report in 12 months on the impact of current and planned changes to city centre regulations and other initiatives aimed at mitigating the effects of issues highlighted in complaints received from businesses and members of the public.

8 **Wolverhampton City Council/Wolverhampton Homes Housing Support Services Review**

Mark Henderson, Director of Housing, Wolverhampton Homes, introduced the report and explained that panel members were invited to comment and contribute to initial ideas for the future provision of housing support and service. Director of Housing explained that this is a joint review between Wolverhampton Homes and the City of Wolverhampton Council. Director of Housing explained that the total cost of providing current level of service by both organisations is estimated to be £2.5 million annually and there were opportunities to review areas of duplication.

Director of Housing explained that there are discussions on-going about the idea of setting up a co-located team providing housing support and housing options advice on a similar basis as the Anti-Social Behaviour Team to provide advice. However, no decision has yet been made.

The panel commented that difficult to assess the impact of any proposed changes to the service without details of the client base and the numbers of staff providing support. Director of Housing explained that the service receives enquires from 60-80 families moving into the City, but also provides help to people who need help to manager their tenancy.

Chris Hale, Head of Housing, commented on the support available to people who are homeless and the importance of early intervention to avoid the problems caused. Head of Housing commented that the plans provide an opportunity for both organisations to work better together and achieve better outcomes. Head of Housing commented on the importance of checking that the budget is spent in the right way.

Lesley Roberts, Strategic Director of Housing, commented on the need to provide the right help and avoid duplication.

The panel welcomed the report

Resolved:

The panel to receive a progress report with the findings of the housing support services review in December 2016

9 **Improving the City Housing Offer Housing Company Outline Business Case**

Exclusion of the public and press

[To pass the following resolution:

That in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business as they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information falling within paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Act relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)]

Lesley Roberts, Strategic Director of Housing, presented the report to the panel.

The panel welcomed the report.

Resolved:

Cllr Bateman agreed to be the nominated representative of the panel on the Councillor Steering Group to consider and comment on proposals to set up a Housing Company.

This page is intentionally left blank



Vibrant and Sustainable City Scrutiny Panel

14 April 2016

Report title	Keeping the City Clean	
Cabinet member with lead responsibility	Councillor Steve Evans City Environment	
Wards affected	All	
Accountable director	Ross Cook, City Environment	
Originating service	Public Realm Regulatory Services Waste and Recycling	
Accountable employee(s)	Steve Woodward	Head of Service – Public Realm
	Tel	01902 554260
	Email	Steve.woodward@wolverhampton.gov.uk
	Andy Jervis	Head of Service – Regulatory Services
	Tel	01902 551261
	Email	andy.jervis@wolverhampton.gov.uk
Report to be/has been considered by		

Recommendation(s) for action or decision:

The Panel is recommended to:

1. Note and comment upon a range of actions being undertaken to keep the city clean.

1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 To provide information to the Vibrant and Sustainable City Scrutiny Panel on a range of actions being taken to keep the city clean for them to review and comment upon.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 A clean city is a better place to live, work and visit, and will attract investment and create job opportunities. Maintaining and improving our streets and green spaces will continue to create pride in our city by improving the quality of our local environment - bringing environmental, economic, social and health benefits. Keeping the city clean is one of the key themes of the Council's corporate plan.

- 2.2 The council spends considerable resources on cleanliness in the city across a range of services within the City Environment portfolio. It is important that services across the Council work together to maintain a clean city and any issues viewed on a holistic basis.

- 2.3 Activities to keep the city clean may be divided into three headings:

- Cleansing services – street cleansing, waste collection
- Enforcement activities – littering, fly tipping
- Community engagement and participation – volunteer groups, pride in the city

The activities are led by City Environment with the creation of the new portfolio from 1 January 2016 bringing together the services involved in these activities offering opportunities to benefit from improved co-ordination.

- 2.4 Services have been subject to on-going budget pressures, as have all areas of the Council, but cleanliness has been maintained and improved under various measures supported by adopting new approaches and identifying efficiency and operational improvements.

3.0 Cleansing Services

- 3.1 Last year (2015/16) Public Realm cleansing services:

- Removed 4,000 tons of litter and detritus
- Collected 363 dead animals
- Cleaned up after 117 Road Traffic Collisions during normal working hours
- Responded to 395 emergency 'out of hours' call outs
- Collected 3,901 syringes from 144 locations
- Emptied 1,400 litter bins on a regular basis
- Installed/replaced 108 litter bins
- Litter picked and swept 750 km of highway on a regular basis
- Attended 2,359 reports of fly tipping which included 1,335 items of furniture and 576 fridge/freezers

- 3.2 The service undertakes an annual survey for customer satisfaction, the most recent one being carried out in July / August 2015, via an online survey, as well as inviting members of the citizen's panel to participate and postings on our Facebook page. The results of this and the previous three years are shown below:

Satisfaction with	2015	2014	2013	2012
Public Realm Services overall	73%	52%		
Street Cleansing	72%	53%	62%	61%
Grass Cutting	68%	53%	74%	72%
Condition of adopted highway	49%	29%	36%	45%
Street lighting (new question)	91%			
Winter Gritting (new question)	83%			
Pest Control	55%	23%		
Green Open Space & Play Areas	79%	58%	63%	65%

- 3.3 Customer satisfactions results show that overall 2015 was the best year since data was captured in this format. Street cleansing and the condition of green and open spaces showed particular improvement in the year.
- 3.4 In the first 10 months on 2015/16, 4,851 street cleansing issues were reported, of which 95 per cent were responded to within Service Level Agreement (SLA) timescales. Types of enquiries are given below:

Customer Services Enquiries 2015/16 - Cleansing Service Type	Monthly Average
Litter	72
Faeces/Vomit/Blood	26
Dead animals	30
Road Traffic Accidents and spillages	12
Litter/Dog Bin emptying	0
Out of Hours Emergencies	37
Fly tipping	234
Graffiti	7
Parks vandalism/damage/security	6

- 3.5 Street cleansing operations are targeted based upon usage and volumes of litter.
- The majority of 'A' roads have a minimum weekly manual litter pick together with a fortnightly mechanical sweep of the pavement and road channel.
 - All 'B' roads and some 'A' roads have minimum fortnightly manual litter pick together with a 6-weekly mechanical sweep of the pavement and road channel.

- All other roads are litter picked every 6 weeks and mechanically swept every 12 weeks.
- Areas with high footfall (i.e. shopping areas) and areas with a history of being heavily littered receive regular cleansing as necessary. The cleansing frequencies range from continuous attendance/daily/three times a week/weekly and fortnightly

3.6 Cleansing performance data for the three years to 2014/15 is shown in **Appendix 1**.

Data is not yet available for 2015/16 however in year figures indicate that the position is forecast to have improved (in line with customer satisfaction). It should be noted that the cleansing functions in the west area of the city have been undertaken by our partner Amey. As from 1 April 2016 these functions have been brought back in house with the expiration of the contract and it is anticipated that this will provide the opportunity to enhance performance in that area.

4.0 Enforcement Activities

4.1 Enforcement activities provide for an effective deterrent to illegal littering and fly tipping. For such activities to be properly effective there needs to be good awareness of the penalties and the likelihood of prosecution. Therefore the Council has actively publicised the enforcement undertaken by:

- Publicity campaigns e.g. dog fouling supported by strong social media activity and warning signs
- Publicising new enforcement approaches e.g. Kingdom Security enforcement
- Publicising successful prosecutions: in particular littering, dog fouling and fly tipping prosecutions have featured prominently in the Express and Star and on the Council's website and via social media.

4.2 In August 2015 a trial of utilising a private sector company to provide littering and dog fouling enforcement was approved. The trial proved highly successful with many positive comments from residents and businesses. An average of 160 fixed penalty notices (FPN's) have been issued per week and a number of successful prosecutions have also been made.

4.3 Approval has been given for tendering of a contract for on-going enforcement services in line with the trial and it is intended that a three year contract will be awarded for August 2016. As part of the tender specification consideration is being given to other activities that could form part of the portfolio of enforcement activities under the contract.

4.4 Fly tipping is an increasing problem nationally and in line with this Wolverhampton has also experienced an increase. Historically prosecutions have proved very difficult to achieve due, in large part, to obtaining adequate evidence. Witnesses are usually very unwilling to come forward.

4.5 In order to combat fly tipping the Council has identified hot spot locations and used signage to discourage fly tipping and warn of the penalties. In conjunction with this the

Council has deployed cameras to detect illegal activity. This has resulted in a number of successful prosecutions which have been well publicised.

- 4.6 Following from the success of the deployment of existing cameras the Council has ordered three additional mobile cameras for deployment in 2016/17. These will provide greater coverage of hot spot areas and act as further deterrent to fly tipping.

5.0 Community Engagement

- 5.1 During 2015/2016 we have actively encouraged Friends Groups, User Groups and other Community Groups to join forces and work in partnership with the City of Wolverhampton Council to achieve improvements as part of our Cleaner Greener Better initiative. By promoting an increased pride in the place of our birth, or home of choice, to make it a more pleasant environment for all; encouraging businesses to see the true potential Wolverhampton has to offer. Forging links with faith groups such as the Ahmadiyya Muslim Association has also encouraged multi-cultural community activities, building relationships of inclusion, participation and understanding of our neighbours.
- 5.2 These activities have included such things as organised litter picks as part of 'Operation Spring Clean' and 'Clean for the Queen', 'Summer Challenge' etc. Rose planting and on-going maintenance by residents in small streets and fruit tree planting, as well as on-going maintenance to support the work of the Public Health Team's Call to Action and 'Obesity Challenge'.
- 5.3 The total number of hours that individuals and groups have contributed to support the cleanliness of the City during 2015/16 was 1,738 and we have plans to increase this significantly in future years.
- 5.4 These activities are part of the broader drive for community engagement within the Council as a whole, as evidenced by the development of the volunteering strategy, and City Environment in particular. Further activities that support community engagement to cleanliness activities include the competition to design posters on the side of refuse vehicles run in local schools and the Snow Wolves scheme for winter snow clearance.

6.0 Financial implications

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.
[TT/05042016/W]

7.0 Legal implications

- 7.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.
[TS/04042016/C]

7.0 Environmental implications

- 7.1 Keeping the city clean helps to improve and safeguard the environment for all residents , businesses and workers in the city.

Customer Enquiries	2012/13			2013/14			2014/15			increase / decrease over the 3 year period
Grounds Maintenance:	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	
• % Customer response time - action determined within 5 working days	98.38%	97.22%	97.81%	97.09%	97.92%	97.53%	94.98%	86.75%	91.08%	6.73% -
• No. within SLA	182	175	357	167	188	355	246	203	449	
• No. of enquiries received	185	180	365	172	192	364	259	234	493	128 +
Street Cleansing: Litter& Detritus	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	
• % Customer response time - completed within 5 working days	95.53%	94.81%	95.26%	90.00%	93.53%	91.36%	92.67%	94.20%	93.18%	2.08% -
• No. within SLA	427	256	683	396	260	656	417	211	628	
• No. of enquiries received	447	270	717	440	278	718	450	224	674	43 -
Street Cleansing: dog fouling	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	
• % Customer response time - completed within 2 working days	92.68%	99.44%	95.29%	86.22%	97.77%	90.69%	92.02%	94.40%	92.84%	2.45% -
• No. within SLA	266	179	445	244	175	419	219	118	337	
• No. of enquiries received	287	180	467	283	179	462	238	125	363	104 -
Street Cleansing: Dead Animals	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	
• % Customer response time - completed within 2 working days	98.84%	98.73%	98.81%	95.43%	97.67%	96.17%	94.86%	96.51%	95.33%	3.48% -
• No. within SLA	171	78	249	167	84	251	203	83	286	
• No. of enquiries received	173	79	252	175	86	261	214	86	300	48 +
Street Cleansing: RTC & Spillages	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	
• % Customer response time - completed within 2 working days	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.64%	100.00%	95.92%	98.81%	100.00%	99.15%	0.85% -
• No. within SLA	92	38	130	106	35	141	83	33	116	
• No. of enquiries received	92	38	130	112	35	147	84	33	117	13 -
Street Cleansing: Syringes	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	
• % Customer response time - completed within 2 working days	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	97.22%	100.00%	98.68%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%
• No. within SLA	43	16	59	35	40	75	42	75	117	
• No. of enquiries received	43	16	59	36	40	76	42	75	117	58 +
* No. of enquiries Out of Hours			15			16			27	12 +
• No. of syringes collected (a large number are collected in West Park daily)			940			876			3901	2,961 +
Autumn Leafing:	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	
• % Customer response time - completed within 5 working days	98.67%	100.00%	99.32%	100.00%	98.51%	99.32%	95.16%	93.10%	93.96%	5.36% -
• No. within SLA	74	72	146	81	66	147	59	81	140	
• No. of enquiries received	75	72	147	81	67	148	62	87	149	2 +
Litter/Dog bin emptying:	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	East	West	Total	
• % Customer response time - completed within 2 working days	97.10%	100.00%	97.73%	95.31%	91.07%	93.33%	94.94%	89.74%	93.22%	4.51% -
• No. within SLA	67	19	86	61	51	112	75	35	110	
• No. of enquiries received	69	19	88	64	56	120	79	39	118	30 +
Out of Hours emergencies:										
• % Customer response time - attended within 1 hours	100.00%			100.00%			100.00%			0.00%
• No. of enquiries received	403			409			395			8 -
Customer Enquiries	2012/13			2013/14			2014/15			increase / decrease over the 3 year period
Fly tipping:										
• % Customer response time - removed within 5 working days	98.59%			99.68%			96.91%			1.68% -
• No. within SLA	1047			1560			2286			
• No. of enquiries received	1062			1565			2359			1,297 +
• No. of individual Fridges collected	0			435			573			573 +
• No. of individual bulky household items collected	609			838			1335			726 +
Graffiti:										
• % Customer response time - removed within 5 working days	98.10%			98.11%			95.70%			2.4% -
• No. within SLA	310			208			89			
• No. of graffiti removal	316			212			93			223 -
New/Replacement Litter/Dog Bins:										
• % Customer response time - action determined within 5 working days	96.90%			90.12%			94.44%			2.46% -
• No. within SLA	125			146			102			
• No. of enquiries received	129			162			108			21 -
Pest Control - WCC:										
• % Customer response time - PAID treated within 5 working days	95.96%			85.90%			97.52%			1.56% +
• No. within SLA	285			609			904			
• No. of enquiries received	297			709			927			630 +
• % Customer response time - FREE treated within 10 working days	95.90%			90.33%			24.27%			71.63% -
• No. within SLA	3275			1083			226			
• No. of enquiries received	3415			1199			931			2,484 -
Arboriculture - Customer Response Times:										
• % Emergency: same day response	100.00%			93.69%			94.94%			5.06% -
• No. within SLA	110			104			75			
• No. of enquiries received	110			111			79			31 -
• % Priority: action determined within 5 working days	97.62%			100.00%			98.73%			1.11% +
• No. within SLA	41			60			78			
• No. of enquiries received	42			60			79			37 +
• % Routine: action determined within 20 working days	97.15%			99.12%			99.27%			2.12% +
• No. within SLA	648			678			409			
• No. of enquiries received	667			684			412			255 -
Parks vandalism/damage/security:										
• % Customer response time - action determined within 5 working days	n/k			100.00%			97.92%			2.08% -
• No. within SLA	n/k			81			94			
• No. of enquiries received	n/k			81			96			15 +
Other customer enquiries										
• Compliments	47			48			40			7 -
• Corporate Complaints	7			15			36			29 +
• Member enquiries	39			55			131			92 +
• Other	22			16			30			8 +
• FOI	2			4			10			8 +

This page is intentionally left blank