

Joint Scrutiny Panel of Somerset Waste  
Board meeting  
08 March 2018

---

Performance Report - April 2017 to December 2017

Lead Officer: David Oaten, Contracts Manager – Treatment & Infrastructure

Author: John Helps, Performance Monitoring Officer

Contact Details: 01823 625705

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Summary:</b></p>  | <p>This report summarises the key performance indicators for the period from April 2017 to December 2017 compared to the same period in the last two years. Key headlines are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less waste (both residual &amp; recycling) has been produced which has resulted in a slightly higher recycling performance</li> <li>• A continued trend of lower tonnages through the recycling sites, particularly for residual waste</li> <li>• The results of the in depth performance review of missed collections at Appendix C1</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p>                                   | <p><b>That the Joint Waste Scrutiny Panel notes the performance results within Appendices A &amp; B, and the findings of the missed collections deep dive (Appendix C).</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Reasons for recommendations:</b></p>                      | <p>Report for information only. Whilst this report sets out specific actions being taken to address areas of concern, the business plan sets out how we focus on improving performance.</p>  |
| <p><b>Links to Priorities:</b></p>                              | <p>Transparency – Publishing Key Performance Indicators</p>  |
| <p><b>Financial, Legal, Equalities and HR Implications:</b></p> | <p>No direct financial, legal or HR implications.</p>  |
| <p><b>Risk Assessment:</b></p>                                  | <p>Areas of poor performance inform our overall risk assessment</p>  |

## 1. Background

- 1.1. Reports with a reduced range of key performance indicators for services managed by Somerset Waste Partnership are presented to the Board in September (Quarter 1 performance) and for February (Quarter 3 performance). To set the missed collection deep dive in context, this report is shared with the Joint Waste Scrutiny Panel.

## 2. Performance Findings

### 2.1. Headline performance figures

Headline figures to note for April to December 2017 compared to the same period in 2016 are shown in the table below. The RAG ratings indicate where trends are on track (green), not as desired (amber) or a cause for concern (red). No significant changes to these trends have occurred since finalisation of these figures.

| National Indicators                                       | Result  | + / -    | Appendix | Lines        |
|---|---------|----------|----------|--------------|
| Residual waste per household (NI 191) – Kgs per household | 366.28  | -0.52%   | A1       | (38)         |
| Recycling & reuse rate (NI 192) - %                       | 53.63%  | 0.11%    |          | (39)         |
| Waste landfilled (NI 193) - %                             | 44.84%  | -0.35%   |          | (40)         |
| Waste Streams   | Tonnes  | % Change |          |              |
| Total Reused, Recycled & Composted                        | 107,166 | 0.09%    |          | (25)         |
| Residual Waste Landfilled                                 | 88,248  | -0.84%   |          | (26, 29, 30) |
| Recovery Material   | 3,791   | 4.93%    |          | (27, 28, 31) |
| Total Household Waste Arising                             | 198,157 | -0.26%   |          | (32)         |
| Total Commercial Waste Arising                            | 4,398   | 6.67%    |          | (24, 34)     |

| Kgs per Household Headlines | Kg/hh  | + / - | A2 |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------|----|--|
| Garden Waste                | 156.18 | 5.94  |    |  |
| Recycled Material           | 188.78 | -5.06 |    |  |
| Residual Waste Landfilled   | 366.28 | 1.91  |    |  |

| Flytips   | No.   | + / - | B1 |  |
|-----------|-------|-------|----|--|
| Total No. | 3,423 | -87   |    |  |

### 2.2. Analysis of performance drivers

#### 2.2.1. Overall tonnages

Appendix A1 shows tonnage by material type as well as the former key national performance indicators arranged in alphabetical commodity order and showing data for 2 comparative years. It shows data for the whole partnership (i.e. kerbside and recycling sites). The headline tonnage figures show that tonnages have declined during 2017. Key points are:

- A 0.04% (42 tonnes) decrease in household waste reused, recycled and composted (line 23),
- A 0.26% (552 tonnes) decrease in overall household waste arisings (line 32),
- A 0.74% (656 tonnes) decrease in household waste landfilled (line 33).

Appendix A2 shows that Somerset households produced less waste, when

compared to the first nine months of 2016, with a reduction of 1.40 Kgs per household, bringing the total waste arising to 789.97 Kgs per household, this reduction predominantly achieved at the recycling sites but offset by a slight rise of 2.42 Kgs per household in the amount of waste presented for collection at the kerbside.

### **2.2.2. Recycling and reuse**

Appendix A1 shows the materials recycled overall (both kerbside and recycling sites) and A2 shows headline Kgs per household performance for kerbside collection services and recycling sites.

Changes worthy of note include:

- A continued drop in the amount of paper collected, with a decrease of 8.68% (754 tonnes - line 18),
- A 0.31% (239 tonnes) increase of residual waste sent to landfill collected from the kerbside (line 29), suggesting that the majority of material displaced from the recycling sites (981 tonnes – line 30) has not been presented for collection.

### **2.3. Garden Waste**

The amount of garden waste treated during this period at both the recycling sites and at kerbside increased by 3.96% (1,491 tonnes - line 10). Increases in garden waste per household were 5.94 kg/hh, with a continued increase seen in kerbside collections of 5.73kg/hh to 68.61 kg/hh, and also by a slight increase at recycling sites of 0.21 kg/hh bringing the total through the sites to 87.57 kg/hh. The main driver for changes in garden waste remains the weather, with an additional 1,006 tonnes handled during the unseasonably mild weather in October.

### **2.4. Recycling Centres**

Appendix A2 shows headline Recycling Centre performance figures by Kgs per household.

It shows a reduction of material through the recycling sites of 3.82 Kgs per household. There was a loss of 1.33 kg/hh of dry recycling, as well as a decrease of 3.26 kg/hh (including asbestos) of residual waste. The majority of these reductions are thought to be related to the continued successful operation of the permit scheme.

### **2.5. Missed Collections Deep Dive**

As agreed at the December panel meeting, the first area of service performance that has been made the subject of an in depth review is missed collections under the waste collection contract. The deep dive is contained within Appendix C and Members will receive a presentation and verbal update with regard to the main findings at the meeting.

### **2.6. Flytipping**

Appendix B1 shows the level of reported flytips, broken down by waste type and District across Somerset. It shows that the numbers of reported flytips across Somerset continue to decrease slightly compared to 2016-17. In Quarters 1 – 3, the total number of flytips has reduced by 87 (-2.48%) incidents. There were decreases in the numbers reported in South Somerset, Taunton Deane and West Somerset, with Mendip and Sedgemoor showing increases (5% & 8% respectively) in the number of incidents. As previously reported, whilst we include fly tipping numbers as part of this Board report, as the actions of the SWP can have an influence on flytipping, in reality, SWP has little control, or influence over the numbers being shown as the statutory function to manage fly tipping events still rests with the partner District authorities.

### **3. Implications**

#### **3.1. Implications of the performance data are:**

- The focused review of missed collection performance is contained within Appendix C of this report and once the recommendations are put in place, it is expected that missed collection statistics will be better founded, easier to manage and will subsequently reduce in number, leading to improved overall service performance.
- Implementation of the permit scheme at the Recycling Sites continues to be monitored closely and appears to be having the desired impact