



## Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee

**Thursday 14 March 2019 at 6.00 pm**

Boardrooms 3-5 - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,  
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

Kelcher (Chair)  
Kansagra (Vice-Chair)  
S Butt  
Gbajumo  
Gill  
Kabir  
Mashari  
Nerva

#### Substitute Members

Councillors:

Aden, Ethapemi, Hassan, Johnson, Kennelly, Long and  
Stephens

Councillors:

**For further information contact:** Bryony Gibbs, Governance Officer  
020 8937 1355; [bryony.gibbs@brent.gov.uk](mailto:bryony.gibbs@brent.gov.uk)

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

[www.brent.gov.uk/committees](http://www.brent.gov.uk/committees)

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

### **Notes for Members - Declarations of Interest:**

If a Member is aware they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest\* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent and must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If a Member is aware they have a Personal Interest\*\* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent.

If the Personal Interest is also significant enough to affect your judgement of a public interest and either it affects a financial position or relates to a regulatory matter then after disclosing the interest to the meeting the Member must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item, except that they may first make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to the matter, provided that the public are allowed to attend the meeting for those purposes.

### **\*Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:**

- (a) **Employment, etc.** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit gain.
- (b) **Sponsorship** - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of election; including from a trade union.
- (c) **Contracts** - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between the Councillors or their partner (or a body in which one has a beneficial interest) and the council.
- (d) **Land** - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.
- (e) **Licences** - Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.
- (f) **Corporate tenancies** - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which the Councillor or their partner have a beneficial interest.
- (g) **Securities** - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

### **\*\*Personal Interests:**

The business relates to or affects:

(a) Anybody of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management, and:

- To which you are appointed by the council;
- which exercises functions of a public nature;
- which is directed is to charitable purposes;
- whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy (including a political party or trade union).

(b) The interests a of a person from whom you have received gifts or hospitality of at least £50 as a member in the municipal year;

or

A decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial position of:

- You yourself;
- a member of your family or your friend or any person with whom you have a close association or any person or body who is the subject of a registrable personal interest.

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Item	Page
<b>1 Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members</b>	
<b>2 Declarations of interests</b>	
Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, the nature and existence of any relevant disclosable pecuniary, personal or prejudicial interests in the items on this agenda and to specify the item(s) to which they relate.	
<b>3 Deputations (if any)</b>	
To hear any deputations received from members of the public in accordance with Standing Order 67.	
<b>4 Minutes of the previous meeting</b>	1 - 8
To approve the minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record.	
<b>5 Matters arising (if any)</b>	
To consider any matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.	
<b>6 Chair's Report</b>	9 - 14
This report includes notes from the chair of the committee on the agenda for the March meeting, including reasons for the selection of topics, as well as on the work of the committee outside of public meetings.	
<b>7 Contracts 2023 - Merits &amp; obstacles of bringing services back in-house</b>	15 - 58
This report examines the process for establishing terms and the merits / obstacles to bringing the Business Rates service back in-house when the existing contract expires and makes recommendations accordingly.	

**8 Air Quality Pledges**

To  
follow

This report informs the committee how the Council is progressing with local air quality action plan measures.

Report to follow

**9 Update on initiatives to reduce barriers and increase recycling in flats and flats and above shops** 59 - 68

This report provides clarification of the council's recycling service, current challenges with regards to increasing recycling and what steps are being taken to develop the best possible recycling service for our residents

**10 Any other urgent business**

Notice of items to be raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Head of Executive and Member Services or his representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 60.

**Date of the next meeting: Monday 15 April 2019**



- Please remember to set your mobile phone to silent during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.



Brent

## MINUTES OF THE RESOURCES AND PUBLIC REALM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE Thursday 7 February 2019 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor and Councillors Nerva, S Butt, Gbajumo, Kabir, Mashari and Colwill

Also Present: Councillor McLennan

### 1. **Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gill and Kansagra. Councillor Colwill was attending the meeting as a substitute member on behalf of Councillor Kansagra.

### 2. **Declarations of interests**

For purposes of transparency, Councillor Mashari advised that she volunteered at Sufra NW London foodbank.

### 3. **Deputations (if any)**

None.

### 4. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 January 2019 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

### 5. **Matters arising (if any)**

### 6. **Chair's Report**

The committee considered the Chair's report which included comment on the agenda for the current meeting, reasons for the selection of topics, and highlighted work of the committee outside of public meetings.

The Chair noted that with the committee's agreement the first item on the agenda, Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging, would be postponed to the meeting due to be held on 15 April 2019. There was also to be a further addition to the work programme for the 15 April 2019 meeting to examine the Deloitte Sports Business Group report on the Economic impact of Wembley Stadium for the 2017/18 event season, published in December 2018. Representatives of the Deloitte Sports Business Group and the Football Association would be invited to attend.

RESOLVED: that the report of the Chair of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee be noted.

**7. Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging**

RESOLVED: that consideration of this report be deferred to the meeting of the Resources and Public Realms Scrutiny Committee scheduled for 15 April 2019.

**8. Complaints Annual Report 2017 - 2018**

Councillor McLennan introduced the Complaints Annual Report 2017 – 2018 to the committee which focussed on the nature of complaints and the learning and improvements from complaints and Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) cases. Customer Services and Parking Enforcement were the top two complaint themes across the Council. The former mostly related to the Housing Management service, with which historically there had been a number of issues; this service had recently been brought back in house. Overall there had been improvements in the volume and timeliness with which complaints were addressed which reflected the hard work of the Performance Team with service areas. Councillor McLennan introduced Irene Bremang (Head of Performance and Improvement) to the committee, advising that she was present to help address members' queries.

In the subsequent discussion the committee emphasised the importance of the neutrality of the Annual Complaints Report and highlighted that both increases and decreases in complaints for different service areas were interpreted as positive trends, with the former cited as an example of improved customer awareness of how to make a complaint. Councillor McLennan welcomed and accepted the feedback and explained that service areas were encouraged to view complaints as a means of service improvement.

The committee then questioned what evidence was drawn upon to determine when a service had acted correctly. Comment was sought on whether the categorisation of the cause of a complaint as 'customer dissatisfaction with a policy decision' could obscure incidents of poor customer care and it was queried whether the Deputy Leader would support a greater emphasis on customer care in the recruitment process. Further comment was sought on the reduction in the percentage of stage 2 corporate complaints resolved within the target timescales. Queries were raised regarding the implementation of LGO recommendations and how the learning from these was embedded across the organisation. Members questioned how the council ensured that all departments followed the same robust approach to resolving and acting upon complaints. It was queried why the benchmarking data provided was not drawn from neighbouring boroughs. Members highlighted that residents had reported difficulties in getting through to the council via telephone and sought an update on the matter. The committee questioned whether the council could broaden the ways in which people could submit feedback, for example by providing emoji reaction buttons to indicate positive or negative experiences for those using the council's online services. In concluding their questioning, the committee asked what further analysis could be undertaken to provide assurance that members' expectations would be met with respect to those areas with the greatest volume of complaints.

In response to the queries raised, Irene Bremang explained that all complainants had the right to proceed to stage 2 of the procedure and further if they felt their complaint had not been addressed satisfactorily at the first stage. If the complainant was objecting to a decision determined by council policy, the service area was deemed to be not at fault and this would be reflected in the council's response to each stage of a complaint. It was emphasised that there was no excuse for poor customer care and members' attention was directed to Appendix C which set out a root cause analysis of complaints and associated remedial actions. There were 237 complaints related to customer care in Brent Housing Partnership/Housing Management, of those 181 had been upheld. The Complaints Team had worked closely with the service area to identify issues and an action plan was in place which included customer service training to be provided across the whole service. Councillor McLennan confirmed that she would be supportive of a greater emphasis on customer care in the recruitment process, if existing provision was not sufficient; however, noted that the expectation was that if the council's standards were not being met, this should be addressed via the capability procedure.

Addressing members' concerns regarding the timeliness of Stage 2 complaints, Irene Bremang highlighted that the challenge principally related to the Children's Statutory Complaints procedure. Whilst there was only a small number of cases per year, these were very complex and required investigation by an independent investigator. The Complaints Team had implemented a tracker to monitor Children's Statutory Complaints. It was noted that there had been a significant improvement in the timeliness of dealing with corporate complaints.

Irene Bremang explained that LGO responses and decisions were reviewed by the Complaints Team and senior managers to ensure that any learning points for the organisation were captured. There had been 168 complaints referred to the LGO for 2017/18: approximately half of these were returned to the council for local resolution and 21 had been upheld. The recommendations of the LGO in such cases would be discussed with the senior managers of the relevant service area to ensure they were appropriately implemented. The LGO also provided an annual report to the council and this was analysed and discussed with the Council Management Team which comprised the Chief Executive, Strategic Directors and other senior officers. Part of the analysis of the annual report included a review of the outcomes and remedies at the first and second stage prior to escalation to the LGO.

There was an expectation that all complaints were addressed with the principles of best practice in mind; namely early resolution where possible, clear responses setting out corrective action and, where a complaint is upheld, ensuring an apology is issued. However, it was important that service areas tailored the response as appropriate for the service user. Councillor McLennan emphasised that the Cabinet also received quarterly complaints report to enable collective monitoring across Lead Members' portfolio areas.

The committee was further informed by Irene Bremang that benchmarking data had been drawn from other councils' published data. Unfortunately, there was no requirement to publish information on non-statutory complaints and therefore, it was not always possible to obtain comparable data from neighbouring authorities. Councillor McLennan welcomed the suggestion to broaden the modes of feedback

for residents and added that the council's telephony system was shortly due to be changed.

The committee was assured by Irene Bremang that there were a number of improvement plans in place to address reoccurring issues in the Housing Management Service. A summary of the improvement actions were listed in the Root Cause Summary Report in Appendix C. The complaints for the parking service related principally to parking tickets or to a perceived lack of enforcement action, both of which fed into officers' review of enforcement activity. It was emphasised that the council fostered a learning culture around complaints and took complaints very seriously.

During the discussion, the committee requested that the following information, which could not be provided during the meeting, be made available to the committee subsequently:

- anonymised LGO recommendations made to the council in the resolution of complaints;
- confirmation of whether any disciplinary action had been taken against any council staff for reasons of persistent poor customer care.
- An update on the back-log of blue badge applications.

RESOLVED:

- i) That it be noted that Cabinet approved the Annual Complaints Report at its meeting on 10 December 2018;
- ii) That Brent Council's performance in managing and resolving complaints be noted;
- iii) That the Deputy Leader, together with the Strategic Director of Resources ensure consideration is given to promoting good customer service skills and experience via the recruitment process;
- iv) That the Director, Performance, Policy and Partnerships provide an overview of the features of the new telephony system due to be used by the council, including whether it logged callers who had hung up due to a long wait and timescales for full implementation.
- v) That the Deputy Leader, together with the Director, Performance, Policy and Partnerships consider ways to broaden opportunities for members of the public to provide feedback to the council across different means of interaction, including the provision of an online feedback mechanism, such as emoji reaction buttons.

## 9. Food banks task group update

The committee received an update report on the progress made against the 36 recommendations set out in 'The Use of Food Banks in Brent' task group report, first published in November 2017. The recommendations were aimed at the council and other organisations including the NHS, foodbanks, the West London Business Alliance, the Department for Work and Pensions, and central government. Members' attention was drawn to the table set out at the end of the update report which provided a summary of the progress made against each of the recommendations. Overall the council had made good progress on those recommendations for which it had oversight and continued to develop good



partnership working to support implementation of some of the more complex recommendations. The recommendations for other organisations had been forward to the relevant teams and recommendations aimed directly at foodbanks would be reviewed through the foodbank network.

The report detailed that the council would continue to work closely with its partners to mitigate the impact that surrounded food insecurity and related issues. It was highlighted that the Policy and Scrutiny Team facilitated the creation of the network of food banks, with its first meeting taking place on 17 January 2019. This was a key step that would enable the sharing of best practice and greater collaborative working between food aid providers and their partners. Further support would be provided to the network including training by the council's Regulatory Services on food safety. The Deputy Leader highlighted that a Food Banks Champion had also now been appointed and was one of the committee's own members, Councillor Mashari, who had Chaired the task group on Food Banks.

Councillor Mashari noted that one of the key recommendations of the task group had been that the council should show strategic leadership with respect to foodbank usage in Brent and emphasised that it was difficult for the council to do so without appropriate monitoring of the scale of the issue. The Deputy Leader agreed and advised that this would be an appropriate function for the Food Banks Champion to take forward, with the support of the council. The Deputy Leader emphasised that this was an issue taken very seriously by the Cabinet and indeed, all members of the council.

During the discussion, the committee requested that the following information, which could not be provided during the meeting, be made available to the committee subsequently:

An update be provided on the progress of the following recommendations of the task group:

- The creation of a council policy on Foodbanks;
- The Cabinet Member for Housing and Welfare Reform to write to the Secretary of State at the DWP outlining the problems caused by UC and other welfare reforms and request for central Government to formally track and monitor food bank usage;
- The Leader should advocate for change in this area via the LGA, LEP and West London Alliance and London Councils and report back in writing to the Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED:

- i) That Cabinet note the committee's view of the importance of the council assuming a strategic leadership role with respect to the issues driving foodbank usage in Brent;
- ii) That a meeting be arranged between the Cabinet Member for Housing and Welfare Reform and the Foodbank Champion to progress the recommendations of the task group, as set out in the report 'The Use of Food Banks in Brent', and other associated actions, and that this meeting be open to all members of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee.

- iii) That members propose a motion for a non-cabinet member debate to be held at full council with the video produced by the task group on food banks shown in introduction to the debate.

## 10. Budget proposals

The committee reviewed the council's budget proposals for 2019/20 and 2020/21 which were due to be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 11 February 2019. The committee had considered a previous iteration of the budget proposals at its meeting on 15 January 2019, when it had reviewed and endorsed the report of the Budget Scrutiny Panel. The Chair highlighted that the views of the committee, along with the recommendations of the Budget Scrutiny Panel, had informed the current version before members. In particular, the Chair welcomed the adoption of a number of key recommendations of the Budget Scrutiny Panel including rejection of the proposals to reduce library opening hours and rejection of the closure of Abbey Road, Brent Reuse and Recycling Facility. There remained however, a number of areas where further feedback would need to be sought from Cabinet.

It was noted that the Budget report set out details of the consultation, scrutiny and equalities processes undertaken with regard to the proposals and revealed the overall financial position facing the council over the following four year period, including risks, issues and uncertainties. The Chair informed the committee that Councillor McLennan (Deputy Leader) and Ravinder Jassar (Head of Finance) were present to address members' queries.

In the subsequent discussion, the committee noted that there was a history of certain departments overspending and underspending, and assurance was sought that this was appropriately accounted for when setting the budgets for these departments. Members questioned whether consultation via Brent Connects was productive and queried whether the council could do anything to attract a greater level of engagement, including reviewing the accessibility of locations. Clarification was sought on how the anticipated additional licensing income from events held at Wembley Stadium would be distributed and whether consideration had been given to compensating the residents most affected by the events. A member suggested that improved public transport signage and indicators would be beneficial to the borough. Highlighting the committee's suggestion made at its last meeting that consideration be given to developing a more strategic and co-ordinated approach to Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds, the committee questioned how this could be considered as part of the budget formulation process. Assurance was sought that the £600k 'pothole' fund provided by Central Government would be used solely for the repair of the Brent's roads. The committee questioned whether the council was consulted about the increase in the Mayor's precept and the impact that this increase was likely to have on Brent's residents. Members queried who would be affected by the reduction in council tax support, proposed for 2020/21, and sought details of the council's policy with regard to using bailiffs to collect unpaid council tax.

In response to the questions raised, Ravinder Jassar confirmed that the budgets were correctly set at the start of the year. The departmental overspend for Children and Young People was borne of an increase in the numbers of Looked After Children and children subject to child protection plans. The underspend for

Regeneration and Environment was a result of early savings and in-year vacancies. Councillor McLennan advised that funding for Children and Young People was a cross-London issue and London Councils was lobbying for greater funding from central government.

Councillor McLennan welcomed any suggestions for enhancing future budget consultations and explained that whilst Brent Connects meetings were a major forum for consultation, they were only one medium through which face to face consultation had been undertaken. Going forward there would be a greater use of social media and other online platforms to increase the council's reach.

Addressing a number of queries, Ravinder Jassar confirmed the anticipated additional income from Wembley Stadium events was not ring-fenced and assured members that the £600k pothole funding would be spent on Brent's roads, adding that the council was required to evidence this to central government. The council was not consulted on the increase in the Mayor's precept, as the GLA had its own consultation process, however, the council had made it clear that the overall increase facing residents was 5.7 percent. Councillor McLennan confirmed that Brent's Council Tax Support Scheme would remain the same for 2019/20 and was currently being reviewed for 2020/21 to ensure it was fit for purpose following the roll out of Universal Credit. Going forward the emphasis of the scheme would be to ensure those who were in work but on low incomes were supported. Members heard that council tax collection had been brought back in-house and that the Council Tax Protocol ensured that Bailiffs were only used for cases where prosecution was deemed appropriate.

Concluding the discussion, the Chair thanked everyone for their contribution and reflected on the challenges facing the council and the strategic value of setting a two year budget. The committee was advised that a statement of the committee's views with respect to the budget proposals would be submitted to Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 11 February 2019.

During the discussion, the committee requested that the following action be undertaken:

- a meeting be arranged between Councillor Nerva and Councillor Tatler (Lead Member for Regeneration, Highways and Planning) to discuss implementing a co-ordinated approach to the use of Neighbourhood CIL.


#### 11. **Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 8.51 pm

M KELCHER  
Chair

**This page is intentionally left blank**

	<p><b>Resources &amp; Public Realm Scrutiny Committee</b> 14 March 2019</p>
	<p><b>Report from the Director of Performance, Policy &amp; Partnerships</b></p>
<p><b>Chair's Report</b></p>	

<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Open or Part/Fully Exempt:</b> <small>(If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)</small>	Open
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	1 – Chair's report
<b>Background Papers:</b>	0
<b>Contact Officer(s):</b> <small>(Name, Title, Contact Details)</small>	Peter Gadsdon, Director of Performance, Policy & Partnerships, <a href="mailto:peter.gadsdon@brent.gov.uk">peter.gadsdon@brent.gov.uk</a>

## 1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The attached paper includes notes from the chair of the committee on the agenda for the March meeting, including reasons for the selection of topics, as well as work of the committee outside of public meetings.

## 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 The committee is asked to note the observations made by the chair in his report at Appendix 1.

## 3.0 Detail

- 3.1 The chair's notes cover a summary of recent budget activity, and an overview of the items for consideration at the March meeting – Contracts 2023; Air quality pledges and Flats and recycling. The report then goes on to mention the forthcoming scrutiny of the Deloitte report into the economic impact of Wembley Stadium, as well as a note on the usefulness of LGA training around scrutiny.

## 4.0 Legal implications

- 4.1 There are no legal implications.

**5.0 Financial implications**

5.1 There are no financial implications.

**6.0 Equality implications**

6.1 There are no equality implications.

**Report sign off:**

**PETER GADSDON**

Director of Performance, Policy & Partnerships.

# **Resource and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee**

## **Chair's Report – March 2019**

### **By Cllr Matt Kelcher**

#### **a) Budget & recommendations**

In January, the final report of the Budget Scrutiny Panel - constituted by this committee - was published. This was based on an in-depth analysis of the draft budget proposals which were released for consultation at the end of the 2018.

You can read the full report [here](#)

We were pleased to note that when the final budget proposals were published, several of the recommendations in the Panel report were accepted. A few examples are given below.

- Taking reductions to library opening hours off the table. We believe that Brent's remaining libraries are valuable hubs offering customer services to residents, particularly young people in education. Given this borough's recent history with library closures, we also felt that a reduction in hours would undermine public trust in the service.
- Not proceeding with a move to fifteen-minute visits in care. Whilst we know many other authorities have taken this drastic step, we believe it should be a source of pride that Brent has not, and made it clear in our report that of all the seventy or so proposals in the draft budget we felt this should be the very last resort.
- Ensuring that the Abbey Road Household Recycling Centre is not completely shut. We believed it would be a clear false economy to pursue a reform which would give most residents in Brent no free and legal place in which to dispose of their household waste. This could only increase illegal dumping and the costs associated with it.

We were also pleased that the final budget report took some steps towards implementing our suggestion that the budget proposals be re-categorised to ensure better transparency and public understanding of the budget.

Initially, all proposals were listed together as cuts, and, I know from conversations with my constituents, that this means many people assume every single one of them is therefore a simple reduction in service. This is not the case. Of course there are proposals which are straight up cuts and cannot be dressed up in any other way - for example, the initial idea to close Abbey Road. However, other ideas in the budget are part of a long term reform process - with incidental savings - and we believe that local people should understand this.

Likewise, small efficiencies in the budget, such as reducing colour printing at the civic centre, cannot really be seen as in the same category as cuts which have an impact on frontline service users.

The final budget report listed how much money would come from each of these categories, and I hope that in future years the initial proposals will be categorised as such from the start of the process.

Following the publication of the final budget papers, our committee was required by the Brent constitution to send a further addendum to cabinet with our final deliberations. In this we highlighted some of the positive developments summarised above. In addition we then also listed the recommendations from the Panel report that we felt had not yet been addressed.

You can read this addendum [here](#)

I attended Cabinet on Monday 11 February to present this paper and press for clear answers on these points. I strongly believe that whenever any scrutiny committee makes a recommendation - in either our written reports, or officially in the minutes of or public meetings - the relevant Cabinet member should be required to give a written response back to the committee before its next meeting.

Of course, the Cabinet are free to reject our recommendations because they disagree with them, or think them impractical. However, I think at the very least we deserve a written response explaining why, and I would support any moves to confirm this in the council constitution.

Therefore, at the public meeting I gave Cabinet one month, until around 11 March, to respond to our outstanding points. I am hopeful of progress.

## **b) Agenda**

We are considering three substantive items at tonight's meeting.

As usual, we have arranged additional investigative work outside of the committee to help all members to understand the issue in context and have all of the information they need on the night. At the time of writing, the following investigations have been prepared.

### Contracts 2023

Many of the Council's major public contracts expire in 2023. This is a once in a generation opportunity for the council to set a complete new direction in how it delivers services.

We have arranged an in-depth briefing session on the matter for members on 13 March to help develop an understanding on the issue before asking questions on the night.

### Air quality pledges

Many of us made air quality pledges in the run up to the last council elections, so the committee wants to know how Brent is fulfilling these, and what else we can do.

To get a different perspective, and outside expertise, we have arranged a meeting for committee members with the local charity and lobby group Clean Air for Brent for 11 March.

### Recycling and flats

At a previous committee meeting, in the last municipal year, we investigated Brent's stalling recycling rates. One of the key issues we uncovered was that residents in flats find it much harder to recycle than those who live in houses.

I know that in my ward this particularly applies to those who live above the shops on Harlesden High Street who have no access to bins and can only leave out recycling bags at certain times of the day. We want to understand these barriers and how the council can improve them.

I have therefore emailed all councillors, of all parties, in Brent to ask them for examples in their wards of problems with recycling in flats. I will share these with members of the committee so that we can get a full picture of the situation in Brent.

## **c) External witnesses**

Members may have seen that the FA recently commissioned Deloitte to review the economic impact of Wembley stadium on our borough.

You can read the full report [here](#)

On 15 April we're calling in witnesses from the FA and Deloitte to give evidence about this report at our public committee meeting. I think it will be of much public interest.




#### **d) Training and development**

Three years ago I completed a national Local Government Association course on effective scrutiny at Warwick Business School. This was very valuable to me as a newly elected scrutiny chair and I picked up many ideas for reform I brought back to Brent.

In January 2019 I repeated the course and was pleased to see that things have changed for the better. People from other councils were now very excited by what we're doing in Brent. In the weeks following the course, the council have received requests from other authorities for more information on ideas I shared during the course, particular around how we ensure process of agenda setting is member led.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

	<p align="center"><b>Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee</b> 14 March 2019</p>
	<p align="center"><b>Report from the Director of Performance, Policy and Partnerships</b></p>
<p><b>Contracts 2023 / Merits &amp; obstacles of bringing services back in-house</b></p>	

<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Key or Non-Key Decision:</b>	Key
<b>Open or Part/Fully Exempt:</b>	Open
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	0
<b>Background Papers:</b>	None
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Pascoe Sawyers, Head of Strategy and Partnerships, <a href="mailto:pascoe.sawyers@brent.gov.uk">pascoe.sawyers@brent.gov.uk</a> 020 8937 1045

## 1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1 The report examines the process for establishing terms and the merits and obstacles to bringing the Business Rates service back in-house when the existing contract expires.

## 2.0 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee to consider and comment on the proposals contained in the report for an in-house Business Rates service, against other options.

## 3.0 Detail

- 3.1 The wider issue of council contracts coming to an end in 2023 is significant, and could dominate discussions over the next few years. There will be many factors to consider, not least value for money and length of contracts.

3.2 This report presented for scrutiny committee focuses on the Business Rates contract in particular, and is thus a case study for the wider issue. Not only will scrutiny of this report be useful in and of itself, it will help scrutiny to think about the issues involved more generally ahead of 2023.

**4.0 Financial Implications**

4.1 As set out in the report

**5.0 Legal Implications**

5.1 As set out in the report

**6.0 Equality Implications**

6.1 As set out in the report

***REPORT SIGN-OFF***

***Peter Gadsdon***

Director Performance, Policy and Partnerships



**Resources and Public Realm  
Scrutiny Committee**  
14 March 2019

**Report from the Strategic Director  
of Resources**

**Merits / Obstacles To Bringing The Business Rates Service  
In-House**

<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Key or Non-Key Decision:</b>	Non-key
<b>Open or Part/Fully Exempt:</b> <small>(If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)</small>	Open
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	One – Cabinet Report Options Appraisal
<b>Background Papers:</b>	None
<b>Contact Officer(s):</b> <small>(Name, Title, Contact Details)</small>	Margaret Read – Operational Director Resources  <a href="mailto:Margaret.read@brent.gov.uk">Margaret.read@brent.gov.uk</a>  T: 0208 937 1521

**1.0 Purpose of the Report**

1.1 This report examines the process for establishing terms and the merits / obstacles to bringing the Business Rates service back in-house when the existing contract expires and makes recommendations accordingly.

**2.0 Recommendations**

**That Scrutiny:**

2.1 Note the evaluation of options for an in house Business Rates service against other available options.

**3.0 Detail**

3.1 A summary of the current Business Rates service context is given below:

- The Business Rates service currently comprises 8,668 commercial properties with an average growth rate of 1% per annum and a net

collectable debit of £132.2m. This compares to 8,262 properties and a net collectable debit of £97m at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012. It is currently anticipated that growth will continue over the next 5 year contract term.

- Whilst a small staffing resource is required for administering the Business Rates service, the administrative complexity in particular the application of small business rates relief, transitional relief and interest calculations on overpayments tends to make this a specialised service with staff often having niche skills and experience. Additionally, the future general revaluation requirement for commercial properties on a three yearly basis means that reliefs and exemptions can often vary on a regular basis and be subject to annual changes at the time of the budget. Consequently, resilience in terms of staff numbers, knowledge, skills and experience are fundamental considerations for the Business Rates service.
- IT Support within the scope of the Business Rates service contract includes support for the Academy Business Rates system, customer portal for the same and associated printing.

3.2 A detailed options appraisal was considered in November 2017 in relation to the existing Revenues and IT Support contract and from which the Cabinet decision to retender the Business Rates service was taken. The public version of this report is attached at Appendix A.

3.3 The existing Revenues and IT Support contract expires on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019. At that time, the Council Tax and associated IT Support service shall transfer back to direct Council provision and consequently this report, does not refer to that service. The Business Rates service and associated IT Support however, has been retendered and a contract award made following approval by Cabinet on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2018 to Capita Business Services Ltd to commence from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019. The contract term is for a five year period that expires on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2024, with an option to extend for a further three years subject to 18 months prior written notice. Consequently, a decision regarding extension of the contract would need to be made by 31<sup>st</sup> October 2022.

3.4 In overall terms, collection performance of the Brent Business Rates service has consistently exceeded contractual targets and demonstrated continuous improvement over the past four years.

Table 1 – Brent Business Rates Collection Performance

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target (%)</b>	<b>Actual (%)</b>
2013/14	97.50	97.56
2014/15	97.70	98.11
2015/16	97.85	98.32
2016/17	98.00	98.74
2017/18	98.20	98.57

3.5 Under the new contract arrangements commencing on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019, Capita will be implementing an online customer portal for Business Ratepayers to access their account information.

## **4.0 Merits and Obstacles to returning service to in house provision**

- 4.1 The relative merits and obstacles arising for the Business Rates service in relation to service models including in house and outsourced arrangements, are set out below:

### In house Service - Advantages

1. In house provision offers an opportunity to directly control and develop the Business Rates service in accordance with Brent's wider strategic objectives, in particular implementation of the Digital Strategy. It would also not preclude the adoption of innovative service delivery models in the future (e.g. shared services).
2. Changes to contract terms and conditions during the life of a contract can often lead to unavoidable price changes. For example, existing contract arrangements provide for change control to be applied where the number of commercial premises increases by a prescribed proportion. Such an issue would not generally arise in relation to an in house service, which would effectively absorb the increase.
3. An in house service may present an opportunity for securing economies of scale in terms of some ancillary support services such as printing for example where current printing arrangements with Lewisham and Southwark Councils could potentially be extended to also include Brent Business Rates. However, concurrently, economies of scale will also be lost, as currently, the service is provided through Capita's business centre in Bromley which provides a range of other Business Rates services.

### In house Service - Disadvantages

1. Performance for Business Rate collection in London is significantly stronger for outsourced services compared to in house ones. Third party service providers for London Authorities have achieved on average 0.5% higher collection rates over the four year period ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017. This will however require further investigation to evaluate whether this is due to the performance of outsourced service providers or other factors.
2. In the event that a decision was made to return some or all of the Business Rates service provided by Capita to in house provision, there is a risk that performance may decline during the latter period of the contract following service of notice. Robust contract management arrangements would need to be maintained to ensure that any risk to service delivery and performance were not adversely affected.
3. The relatively small number of staff required to administer the Business Rates service means that there would be limited resilience in the event of absence. Additionally, Business Rates is a niche service for which it is difficult to recruit knowledgeable and experienced staff.

4. It is currently anticipated that at the end of the existing contract, there would be a limited TUPE transfer of staff for Business Rates and Application Support for the Academy Business Rates IT system if any, as the Business Rates service is provided from offices in Bromley (with staff undertaking identical roles across other Capita Business Rate contracts) and first line application support is provided by the Capita Central Support Team (CST) based in Swindon (that provides support across many of Capita's contracts). As this work requires niche skills and expertise that are not generally available "in house", this would represent a significant risk to service continuity.
5. There is currently no in house experience of hosting and supporting the Business Rates Academy IT system and this could therefore present a significant risk to an in house service.
6. The cost of in house Business Rates service provision may be greater than that of an outsourced service and would not permit any degree of risk transfer as would occur under an outsourcing arrangement.
7. Any requirement for continued hosting and support of the Business Rates customer portal and associated cost will need to be established and a decision taken as to how this will be achieved if the service is to return to in house provision.

#### Shared Service - Advantages

1. Significant examples exist of shared services across the UK. In 2018, the Local Government Association (LGA) "shared service" map indicated 486 shared services yielding total savings of £644M. (i.e. an average saving per shared service of £1.3M). The nature and extent of shared services varies although it is generally recognised that 'standardisation' provides a cost reduction opportunity whether in terms of locality, IT systems, process or management and staffing.
2. A shared Business Rates service arrangement with another Local Authority would not require a procurement process to be undertaken as it is exempt under regulation 12 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 in that:
  - it is a co-operation between participating local authorities aimed at carrying out jointly their public service tasks, involving mutual rights and obligations of the parties;
  - in consideration of the public interest; and
  - the participating local authorities perform on the open market less than 20% of the activities concerned by the co-operation.



### Shared Service - Disadvantages

1. There are a number of well-established examples of shared Revenues services (generally including Housing Benefits services also) within District Council areas where there is a greater potential for achieving economies of scale, improving resilience (particularly for services employing personnel with niche skills and experience) and reducing cost. However, experience of similar shared services within the London area is not as significant and where arrangements have occurred (e.g. the tri-borough partnership of Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham), they have generally ended prematurely.
2. The feasibility / interest in a shared service has previously been explored by Brent with a small number of London Local Authorities having regard to the following key principles:
  - **Locality** – Local Authorities bordering the Brent Council boundary;
  - **Political Composition** – The Local Authority’s political constitution;
  - **Outsourcing arrangements** – Whether the Local Authority has an existing outsourced Revenues / Benefits service arrangement;
  - **Relationship** – Whether the Local Authority has an existing relationship with Brent Council for the provision of IT services;
  - **Common IT systems** – Whether the Local Authority operates a similar core IT system for its Revenues and Benefits service delivery.

However, due to different target operating models being in existence and a limited response, it was concluded that there was little appetite at that time for a shared service from the representatives concerned.
3. OneSource provides shared services on behalf of a small number of London Boroughs and were previously contacted to discuss any potential for a shared service arrangement with Brent, although they did not respond to the enquiry. In this case, the shared service that incorporated Havering and Newham Councils’ Revenues and Benefits services was potentially weakened by the request from Newham Council to withdraw their Revenues and Benefits services from the arrangement. As this effectively eliminated the shared Revenues and Benefits service, any potential benefits that might have existed in terms of resilience, standardisation and cost reduction would appear to have ended, at least in the short term.
4. A shared Business Rates service arrangement would require a suitable partner to be identified and an agreement concluded before the current contract extension cut-off date of 31<sup>st</sup> October 2022 to meet contractual obligations and to leave sufficient time in which to implement any contingency plans, should the need arise.

### Outsourcing - Advantages

1. In terms of collection rate performance, there are currently strong grounds for seeking to retender the Business Rates service, as far as performance is concerned. This is because supplier performance is on average better than

in house performance. Funding arrangements and Business Rates Retention whereby a greater proportion of Business Rates collected may be retained by a Local Authority, are also likely to mean that service collection levels and service delivery costs will continue to be of significant importance in the future.

2. An outsourced service provider is able to mitigate the potential impact of fluctuations in service staffing levels and hence address resilience through the sharing of staff resources across their contract portfolio within a single shared service centre.
3. The price of an outsourced Business Rates service may be lower than an in house one and would also permit a degree of risk transfer to occur which would not be possible with an in house or shared service arrangement with another local authority.

#### Outsourcing - Disadvantages

1. Suppliers have previously indicated that where an incumbent supplier has been in place for a significant period of time, (in this instant, 21 years by 2024), there would have to be significant and compelling reasons for them to consider tendering, particularly as costs of bidding are high and any transition costs associated with taking on the service would increase their costs and reduce their chances of a successful tender.
2. Whilst suppliers have previously indicated a potential interest in tendering for the Business Rates service alone, (i.e. without the IT Support element) or Business Rates with the IT Support element, it is likely that this would result in a limited competitive response in the future for the reasons set out in 1 and 2 above. Additionally, the market position and associated market conditions, including similar contracts being advertised on or around the time that any Brent Business Rates contract may be advertised, may influence the degree of supplier interest and hence competition.
3. It is highly likely that at the end of the Business Rates service contract, there will be a limited TUPE transfer of Business Rates and associated Academy application support staff from Capita. This is because the service is currently provided from their Bromley Business centre (with appropriate IT Support provided from West Malling and Swindon) with staff undertaking similar roles across other Capita Business Rate contracts. Consequently, this would increase the potential service risks for in house provision. In the case of a third party supplier however, staff with the appropriate niche skills and expertise will generally already exist.
4. Changes to contract terms and conditions during the life of a contract can often lead to unavoidable price changes. For example, the existing Capita contract provides for change control to be applied where the number of commercial premises increases by a specified proportion during the life of

the contract. It is possible that any future supplier would require a similar provision to be included within a contract.

5. There is an intention to establish and use the Brent Council debt enforcement team for collecting some Business Rates debts in the future which may present more challenges under a commercial agreement with an outsourced service provider than if the service were to be provided in house.

#### **4.0 Evaluation of Options**

- 4.1 It is difficult to offer a recommendation to progress a particular service strategy at this time particularly when the new Business Rates contract has not yet commenced, performance cannot be evaluated and the business environment and economic factors may change in the interim.
- 4.2 However, the outcome from other local authority service procurements and tenders as well as the retention of key private sector contracts may influence the future approach and market positioning of Business Rates suppliers, and therefore also the strategy adopted by Brent Council for the same.
- 4.3 Whilst on balance, an outsourced Business Rates service is considered to represent the best option for Brent Council at the current time, it is proposed that work be undertaken during the new contract term to ensure that appropriate contingency plans for the service are determined and in place to respond to any changes that may occur as a consequence of the above.
- 4.4 An initial review will be conducted in 2019/20 and it is proposed that this is reviewed annually.

#### **5.0 Financial Implications**

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations proposed within this report at this time.

#### **6.0 Legal Implications**

- 6.1 There are no legal implications arising from the recommendations proposed within this report at this time.
- 6.2 As indicated in paragraph 3.3, the current Revenues and IT Support contract expires on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019 but the Business Rates service and associated IT Support element has already been retendered and a contract award made following approval by Cabinet on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2018 to Capita to commence from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019. The contract term is for a five year period that expires on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2024, with an option to extend for a further three years subject to 18 months prior written notice. If a decision is subsequently taken to return the service to in house provision, this will need to be provided to the contractor (i.e. Capita) by 31<sup>st</sup> October 2022 to comply with contractual obligations.

## **7.0 Equality Implications**

7.1 There are no equality implications arising from the recommendations set out within this report at this time.

## **8.0 Consultation with Ward Members and Stakeholders**

8.1 As this report affects all wards and is for consideration only at this stage, consultation with specific ward members has not been conducted. As this report does not impact on service delivery which will remain unchanged for Brent businesses and residents, consultation with Brent stakeholders has not been conducted.

## **9.0 Human Resources/Property Implications (if appropriate)**

9.1 There are no HR implications arising from the recommendations set out within this report at this time.

**Report sign off:**

**ALTHEA LODERICK**  
Strategic Director of Resources

	<p><b>Cabinet</b></p> <p>13<sup>th</sup> November 2017</p> <p><b>Report from the Strategic Director Resources</b></p>
<p>For Action/Information* <span style="float: right;">Wards affected:</span></p> <p style="text-align: right;">ALL</p>	
<p><b>Revenues and IT Support Service – Future Service Delivery Options</b></p>	

**Not for publication**

Appendices A and D of this report are not for publication as they contain the following category of exempt information as specified in Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, namely: “Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)”

The appendices contain commercially sensitive information that would, or would be likely to, prejudice the Council’s commercial interests. The public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information because if this information is disclosed at this time it could be used by a potential bidder to adversely affect pricing for a potential procurement.

**1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 This report considers and evaluates options for delivery of the Revenues and IT Support Service when the existing contractual arrangements with Capita Business Services Ltd (“Capita”) end on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019 and makes recommendations accordingly.
  
- 1.2 The options appraisal has shown a strong case for the retender of Business Rates as this offers the best prospects for strong performance with more robust resilience and less risk. The options appraisal has also indicated that the overall prospects for Council Tax collection performance improvement are stronger if the service returns to in house provision as this option offers the opportunity to directly control and develop the service in accordance with Brent’s wider strategic objectives, in particular a more corporate approach to debt recovery and implementation of the Digital Strategy. The options appraisal has also indicated

that a retender of the service may not achieve improved collection performance without increased investment through a higher contract price.

- 1.3 As this service has been outsourced since 1995 (i.e. 24 years at contract expiry) this option would incur one-off transition costs of circa £0.3m and would also require growth of circa £0.2m per annum to build capacity for improvement. It should be noted that Council Tax collection performance has been subject to “peaks and troughs” since 2013 with “in-year” collection averaging 95.7%. Over a similar period, significant savings have been achieved through contractual price reductions.
- 1.4 An in house Council Tax service would offer greater flexibility in terms of integrating Revenue collection with Benefits operations particularly as the working age Housing Benefit caseload starts to migrate to Universal credit from 2019. It would also allow greater flexibility in implementing a more corporate approach to debt recovery and implementation of the Digital Strategy.
- 1.5 An alternative option of returning the Council Tax service to in house provision but without growth in funding has also been considered and is not recommended. This is because the increased level of employer costs that would arise from Local Government Pension Scheme contributions and harmonisation of salary scales would necessitate a reduction of approximately seven full time equivalent staff from within the collection and enforcement teams (i.e. after having made due provision for staffing IT related aspects of the service) and this would adversely affect collection performance.
- 1.6 Soft market testing has demonstrated a competitive retender is a viable option for future Council Tax service provision and would facilitate a degree of risk transfer. The key question to be considered therefore is whether the potential benefits to be gained from a potential return to in house provision provide a sufficient return on investment to merit the cost and risks associated with this.

## **2.0 Recommendations**

2.1 The following recommendations are submitted for consideration:

- 2.1.1 Approve the invitation of tenders for the provision of the Business Rates Service (“NNDR”) including associated customer service, IT Support for the Academy IT System and printing for the NNDR service on the basis of the pre-tender considerations referred to in paragraph 5.2.2 and further defined within Appendix F of the report.
- 2.1.2 Approve officers evaluating tenders referred to in 2.1.1 above on the basis of the evaluation criteria set out in Appendix F of the report.
- 2.1.3 Agree the Council Tax Service and associated IT Support (including support for the Northgate IT System, Debtsys for Housing Benefit Overpayments and View 360 electronic document management system) be returned to in house provision at the expiry of the existing Revenues and IT Support Services contract based upon the options appraisal set out within this report.

- 2.1.4 Note that subject to the decision taken in relation to Recommendation 2.1.3, that printing services for the Council Tax and Benefits Services will be procured by the Council (the timing of such procurement to form part of detailed transition plans in order to minimise risk of service disruption at contract expiry).
- 2.1.5. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director Resources in consultation with the Deputy Leader to agree variations to the existing Revenues and IT Support Services contract to permit discrete areas of the existing contract package to be returned to in house provision before the contract expiry date, if appropriate.
- 2.1.6 Approve growth of £0.2m arising from recommendation 2.1.3 as set out within paragraph 3.8 and Section 6 (Financial Implications) of this report.

### **3.0 Detail**

#### **Background**

- 3.1 There is no further contractual provision for extension when the existing Revenues and IT Support contract expires and therefore a decision needs to be taken in sufficient time to implement the preferred option for future service delivery. Implementation will require approximately 15 months, whichever option is determined.
- 3.2 An options appraisal has been undertaken to evaluate the relative merits of future service delivery models. This has included; in house, shared service and a retender. The evaluation of the shared service option has indicated that there is little current appetite amongst potential Local Authority partners. Indeed, more detailed evaluation of a potential shared service with a neighbouring authority has revealed that the financial returns were insufficient to merit either party progressing with them.
- 3.3 Soft market testing indicated that greater supplier interest might be achieved by increasing the current service scope. Consideration has therefore been given to extending the scope of the contract package particularly in relation to the inclusion of the Benefits service. However, changes arising from the roll out of Universal Credit within the Borough from August 2018 and the implementation of the corporate debt management and digital strategy make this option less attractive in terms of future flexibility to change and integrate these services.
- 3.4 The contract with Capita has seen a significant annual price reduction from approximately £3.1m in 2015/16 to its current level of £2.7m. However, annual Council Tax collection performance has been subject to “peaks and troughs” over the past four years, averaging 95.7% “in-year”. The introduction of the local Council Tax Support scheme (“CTS”) in April 2013 has impacted on collection but only in a marginal way. Collection rates for accounts where CTS is awarded are much higher than originally forecast. Non collection of Council Tax arising as a result of localised CTS is estimated to be equivalent to approximately 0.2%

and there have been no significant changes to the Brent CTS scheme since 2013.

- 3.5 Although a tender process would attract market interest, the incumbent supplier is likely to have a financial advantage, as they would not incur the same level of transition costs for “take-on” of the service that another bidder would have.
- 3.6 A re-tender of the service might offer a lower cost option than an in house service and least risk in terms of service continuity with some degree of risk transfer. However, it may not achieve improved Council Tax collection performance without increased investment through a higher contract price and would give less flexibility to develop new operating models for Brent Customer Services in the future. A risk and reward scheme could provide financial incentives for exceeding performance and financial reductions for any failure to achieve these however bidders are likely to price in accordance with the level of financial risk that they consider a contract presents.
- 3.7 The overall prospects for performance improvement are stronger if the service returns to in house provision as this option offers the opportunity to directly control and develop the service in accordance with Brent’s wider strategic objectives, in particular a more corporate approach to debt recovery and implementation of the Digital Strategy.
- 3.8 Analysis of Brent’s Council Tax collection when taking into account deprivation factors indicates there is a potential scope for improvement. The extent of this improvement is difficult to precisely quantify. However, it is considered that there is a potential to improve collection rates to between 95.8% and 96.4% based upon average collection rates for London authorities with broadly similar levels of deprivation - 96.4% representing an additional £0.9m for Brent’s proportion of the collectable debit. An improvement could potentially be achieved within three years based upon the average collection performance for London Authorities that are closely ranked to Brent in terms of deprivation levels and with the increased staffing resource proposed for allocation to proactive collection and enforcement activities. If achieved, improved collection would have positive cash flow benefits and would also reduce recovery costs for future years. A three year improvement plan would be necessary to achieve this, with investment to increase capacity in the first year with scope to then reduce costs in years 2 and 3. Budget growth of £0.2m on current cash limits would be necessary for the in house option for at least the first year of the improvement plan.
- 3.9 Whilst an increased contract price may see an improvement in Council Tax collection performance, the benefits of in house provision as set out within paragraph 3.7 above would not be so easily achieved.
- 3.10 As Council Tax has been outsourced since 1995 (i.e. 24 years at contract expiry), there will be transition costs arising from an in house option. It is estimated that these would be in the region of £0.3m and would cover replacement of Northgate servers and virtualisation of these, early recruitment of Northgate application



support to de-risk the potential loss of expertise at contract expiry; actuarial evaluations and project capacity to oversee the transition. Of these costs, circa £0.2m would be incurred anyway as a consequence of the replacement of Northgate servers and virtualisation and retender arrangements. Appendix B provides a summary of these activities.

- 3.11 Continuing austerity measures and potential changes to Local Government Finance proposed from April 2019 arising from full Business Rates Retention as an alternative to some existing central government grants including Revenue Support Grant (“RSG”) mean that service delivery costs and Revenues collection performance take on increased significance. It is anticipated that the impact of Business Rates Retention will require increased co-ordination between a Business Rates Service Provider, Brent Council and the business community to facilitate and effectively manage potential growth within the Borough and any associated risks. Additionally, in 2022, the five yearly revaluation of commercial properties is also scheduled to take place and this will require effective resourcing and management concurrent with the above changes.
- 3.12 The scheduled roll-out within Brent of the Universal Credit full digital service to working age claims from August 2018 and the subsequent migration of existing working age Housing Benefit claims between 2019 and 2022 will bring significant changes for the future delivery of Housing Benefit. This might present opportunities for exploring new models for the Council Tax Support Scheme and the way in which it is resourced.
- 3.13 Furthermore, the recent establishment of an in house Enforcement Agent service to take on enforcement of Council debts and the proposed move towards a centralised debt management model that makes better use of debt recovery expertise and applies a more co-ordinated approach to repayment of debt, is also anticipated to impact on future service delivery.
- 3.14 Harnessing opportunities presented by the ‘digital revolution’ and referenced within the Digital Strategy, the implementation of Customer Relationship Management (CRM) will bring a greater generic approach to assistance across a range of services rather than the more specialised demand, as experienced at present.
- 3.15 Details of the current service context are contained in Appendix D to this report and are summarised below:
  - The Business Rates service currently comprises 8,668 commercial properties with an average growth rate of 1% per annum and a net collectable debit of £132.2m. This compares to 8,262 properties and a net collectable debit of £97m at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012.
  - The Council Tax service currently comprises 120,037 domestic properties with average growth of 3.2% per annum and comprising a net collectable debit of £132.9m. This compares to 103,086 domestic properties and a net collectable debit of £103m at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012.

- It is anticipated that both the above will continue to experience growth over the next few years as a consequence of both continued demand for housing and the fulfilment of corporate priorities.
- Whilst a lower staffing resource is required for administering the Business Rates service in comparison to Council Tax, the administrative complexity in particular the application of small business rates relief, transitional relief and interest calculations on overpayments tends to make this a specialised service with staff often having niche skills and experience. Additionally, the general revaluation requirement for commercial properties on a five yearly basis means that reliefs and exemptions can often vary on a regular basis and are subject to annual changes at the time of the budget. Consequently, resilience in terms of staff numbers, knowledge, skills and experience are fundamental considerations for the Business Rates service.
- IT Support currently includes support for the Northgate Revenues and Benefits system, Academy Business Rates system, Axis Income Management system, Debtsys for Housing Benefits Overpayments, View 360 electronic document management system and associated printing.

#### 4.0 Options Appraisal

4.1 A summary table and analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of each of the three options shown in paragraph 3.2 above is shown below. Appendix A to this report provides a more detailed table and analysis of these.

Reference Number	Outsourcing	Shared Service	In House
A1	<u>Business Rates</u> The strong London collection performance of suppliers for Business Rates and the proposed retention of 100% Business Rates income from 2019 support the case for retendering Business Rates.	<u>Council Tax and Business Rates Standardisation'</u> provides a cost reduction opportunity whether in terms of locality, IT systems, process or management and staffing.	<u>Council Tax</u> This option presents the best opportunities for improving performance with the flexibility to develop new operating models for Brent Customer Services in the future.
A2	<u>Business Rates</u> Suppliers have a pool of staff available to them with niche skills and expertise in Business Rates.	<u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u> A procurement process would not apply to a shared service arrangement.	<u>Council Tax</u> This option presents the best opportunity for developing the service to achieve corporate aims in relation to debt management, digital strategy and integration of the service with Benefits as Universal Credit is introduced.

Reference Number	Outsourcing	Shared Service	In House
A3	<p><u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u>                      Would probably cost less than the cost of in house service provision but without the flexibility to integrate with other Brent Council services.</p>		<p><u>Council Tax</u>                      An in house option would not preclude the consideration of future innovative operating models including a shared service arrangement for example.</p>
A4	<p><u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u>                      The retender of all or part of the existing contract services in scope would permit a degree of risk transfer that would not be possible with an in house or shared service arrangement.</p>		<p><u>Council Tax</u>                      There could be an opportunity for achieving economies of scale through the procurement of Council Tax and Benefits printing services with other Local Authorities.</p>

### Disadvantages

Reference Number	Outsourcing	Shared Service	In House
D1	<p><u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u>                      Small number of suppliers and with interest potentially being dependent upon other contracts going to the market at the same time.</p>	<p><u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u>                      Where shared Revenues and Benefits service arrangements have occurred in London, they have tended to end prematurely.</p>	<p><u>Business Rates</u>                      Average performance for Business Rates collection in London is significantly weaker for in house services than outsourced ones.</p>
D2	<p><u>Council Tax</u>                      The proposed move towards a centralised debt management model that makes better use of debt recovery expertise and applies a more co-ordinated approach to the repayment of debt in general and a corporate debt management system (“ASH”) may make synergies more difficult to achieve with a third party supplier.</p>	<p><u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u>                      There is little current appetite at present for a shared Revenues and / or Benefits service amongst representatives contacted.</p>	<p><u>Business Rates</u>                      In the case of the Business Rates Academy system, there is no in house experience of hosting and supporting this.</p>

Reference Number	Outsourcing	Shared Service	In House
D3	<u>Council Tax</u> Collection performance for Council Tax may not improve without additional investment that will result in a higher contract price.	<u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u> A shared service arrangement would not permit the same degree of risk transfer as with an outsourced arrangement.	<u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u> In house service provision will cost more than the current annual contract price.
D4	<u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u> Medium term contractual arrangements may restrict the potential for future innovative operating models.		<u>Council Tax and Business Rates</u> In the event that a decision is made to return some or all of the existing services to in house provision, there is a risk that performance may decline over the remaining period of the contract.

## 5.0 Legal Implications

5.1 There are a number of legal implications that will arise in relation to the recommendations in this report and these are summarised, as follows:

### 5.2 Procurement

5.2.1 The estimated total value of the Business Rates Service recommended to be outsourced / procured is higher than the current EU financial threshold for services. A procurement will therefore be subject to the full application of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. The award of the contract is also subject to the Council’s own Standing Orders in respect of High Value contracts and Financial Regulations. As a result, Cabinet approval will be required for the award of the contract and a mandatory ten calendar day standstill period will be applicable to the contract award.

5.2.2 The tender considerations proposed for procurement of the relevant service(s) and subject to Cabinet decision in relation to the recommendations set out within Section 2 of this report, are comprised within Appendix F.

### 5.3 Public Sector Equality Duty

5.3.1 The public sector equality duty, as set out in section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the Council, when exercising its functions, to have “due regard” to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited under the Act, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who have a “protected characteristic” and those who do not share that protected characteristic. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil

partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.

- 5.3.2 This includes enquiring into whether and how a proposed decision disproportionately affects people with a protected characteristic and the need to consider taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it. This includes removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic. For example, taking account of disabled persons' disabilities and the action that could be taken to help a disabled person."
- 5.3.3 In considering the recommendations submitted within this report, an Equality Analysis (please see Appendix G) has been undertaken to ensure that any potential adverse impact to groups that share a protected characteristic has been identified, evaluated and mitigated wherever possible. The analysis has not identified the potential for an adverse impact at this stage.
- 5.3.4 However, any equalities implications arising from the individual recommendations will continue to be considered and assessed as further data / information is obtained or becomes available during the decision-making process.

#### **5.4 TUPE and Pensions**

- 5.4.1 As there is no proposal to transfer work carried out by existing Council employees to a new provider, TUPE shall not affect any Council employees. However, in the case of work activities currently carried out by Capita staff, there will be TUPE and Pensions implications that will need to be addressed through the transition arrangements for in house provision and in the procurement arrangements and contract documentation for retender of the Business Rates service should the recommendations in this report be agreed.

#### **5.5 Public Services (Social Value) Act**

- 5.5.1 The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 requires the Council when procuring services, to consider whether it can achieve an improvement to the economic, social and environmental well-being of an area as part of the procurement of those services. If so, the social value objectives identified must be written into the procurement process. This must be achieved with regard to value for money and in a way that is compliant with public procurement law.
- 5.5.2 Appendix F to this report provides for the inclusion of Social Value within the price and quality weightings proposed within the pre-tender considerations and in accordance with the recommendations set out within Section 2 of this report.
- 5.5.3 It is proposed within Appendix F that a Social Value weighting of 5% split between quality 2.5% and price 2.5% is used for the purposes of the tender evaluation. This is lower than the Brent Council policy of 10% for contracts over £100,000 but as the service is likely to be delivered off site and outside of the

Borough, the potential extent of any social value that might be achieved for Brent Council is lower than would be expected for a contract weighting of 10%.

## 6.0 Financial Implications

6.1 The current annual budget for the Revenues and IT Support Service is £2.9m which is funded from within the existing contract budget held by Brent Customer Services and which includes contract management costs.

6.2 If a decision is taken to return the Council Tax service to in house provision, the total cost of annual provision is estimated to be £3.1m, £0.2m above the current base budget. This is primarily due to pay differentials, higher Brent pension contributions in comparison to Capita and an increased staffing resource considered necessary for the transition period and to enable service improvements to be effectively implemented. This may be summarised as follows:

Staffing for roles that may not transfer under TUPE (e.g. IT)	£0.3m
Additional staffing for Council Tax and harmonisation costs	£0.2m
Additional pensions cost of the proposed new structure	£0.2m
-----	
Increased cost	£0.7m
=====	
Funded by reduction in contract related costs	£0.5m
=====	
Net growth	£0.2m

6.3 In the short term (i.e. years 1 and 2), funding this additional cost from within the overall Customer Services budget would be challenging, given the £1m savings target the department is required to deliver by 31 March 2018. However from year 2 onwards, it is anticipated that the additional cost could be reduced by virtue of synergies obtained through combining similar roles within the Brent Customer Services and the use of other innovative service models.

6.4 The first year of operation would effectively be a transitional phase whilst the new in house service and IT arrangements “bed in” and “one-off” transition costs are currently estimated to be in the region of £0.3m for this purpose. These can be funded through existing earmarked reserves allocated to Customer Services. Additionally, of these costs, approximately £0.2m would be incurred anyway as a consequence of replacing existing Northgate servers and virtualisation. The remaining £0.1m would be for resources needed to effectively implement transition plan arrangements.

6.5 Under the recommendations proposed within this report, a supplier would be responsible for annual Business Rates collection of £138m based upon current levels. Consequently, a reduction in the budgeted collection rate would have a significant impact on the Council’s budgeted income. Provision would therefore need to be considered within any agreed contract for financial incentives and deductions to address variations that could occur.

6.6 It should be noted that the costing implications set out within this report have been based upon existing contract pricing information for 2018/19 and prevailing pay rates. However, actual costs in the future will be subject to due diligence and the tender price of a successful tenderer. Any variations arising as a consequence will need to be addressed through the normal budgetary process.

## **7.0 Risks and Issues**

7.1 The key risks and issues arising in relation to the recommendations set out within Section 2 of this report are shown in Appendix H.

### **Background Papers**

Appendix A – Options Appraisal Advantages and Disadvantages (not for publication)

Appendix B – Transition Costs

Appendix C – London Collection Rate Performance

Appendix D – Service Context (not for publication)

Appendix E – London Local Authority Revenues and Benefits Provision

Appendix F – Pretender Considerations

Appendix G - EIA Screening

Appendix H – Risks and Issues

### **Contact Officer**

Margaret Read

Director of Brent Customer Services

[Margaret.read@brent.gov.uk](mailto:Margaret.read@brent.gov.uk)

0208 937 1521

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## **Appendix 1B – Transition Costs**

Server replacement and virtualisation costs (Including data migration and testing)	£100,000
Project Management / Project Support	£92,000
Actuarial evaluations including bulk transfer arrangements	£10,000
Early Appointment of Application Support	£98,000
<hr/> <b>Total</b>	<hr/> <b>£300,000</b>

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Appendix 1C - Revenues Collection Rate Performance

Over the past four years, in-year collection performance achieved by Capita on behalf of Brent Council has been as shown in Tables 1 and 2 below:

Table 1 – Brent Council Tax Collection Performance

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target (%)</b>	<b>Actual (%)</b>
2013/14	93.80*	95.70
2014/15	95.90	95.60
2015/16	96.00	95.87
2016/17	96.20	95.74

\* Localised Council Tax Support Scheme replaced the national Council Tax Benefit scheme and therefore a lower collection target was agreed.

Table 2 – Brent Business Rates Collection Performance

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target (%)</b>	<b>Actual (%)</b>
2013/14	97.50	97.56
2014/15	97.70	98.11
2015/16	97.85	98.32
2016/17	98.00	98.74

### Analysis of Brent Performance

The above tables indicate that for Brent Council, Business Rates collection has consistently achieved above the contractual target over the past four years whereas Council Tax has performed below target for the same period.

Additionally, Business Rates collection performance has shown continuous improvement over the past four years with Council Tax collection performance predominantly characterised by peaks and troughs.

London Authorities Collection Performance

In terms of outsourced Revenues collection across London, Tables 3 and 4 below indicate collection rates achieved by third party Service Providers over the past four years with tables 5 and 6 providing a comparative in house performance for the same period:

Table 3 – Outsourced Council Tax Collection in London

	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>Average</b>
Barking and Dagenham	94.1	94.3	94.8	95.5	94.7
Barnet	96.4	96.5	96.1	96.1	96.3
Bexley	96.3	96.6	96.7	96.5	96.5
<b>Brent</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>95.6</b>	<b>95.9</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>95.7</b>
Bromley	97.6	97.7	97.8	97.9	97.8
Hounslow	96.7	97.8	97.8	96.8	97.3
Hillingdon	97.9	97.3	95.1	97.3	96.9
Lambeth	94.5	95.0	95.2	95.3	95.0
Westminster	96.3	96.5	96.5	96.4	96.4
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>96.3</b>

Table 4 – Outsourced Business Rates Collection in London

<b>Year</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>Average</b>
Barking and Dagenham	97.0	97.9	98.2	98.3	97.9
Barnet	95.8	96.3	96.7	97.0	96.5
Bexley	98.4	98.5	98.5	98.8	98.6
<b>Brent</b>	<b>97.6</b>	<b>98.1</b>	<b>98.3</b>	<b>98.7</b>	<b>98.2</b>
Bromley	98.7	98.9	99.1	98.9	98.9
Hounslow	99.1	99.4	99.6	99.9	99.5
Hillingdon	99.1	98.7	99.3	98.7	99.0
Kensington and Chelsea	99.2	99.1	99.1	98.9	99.1
Lambeth	98.2	98.5	98.7	99.0	98.6
Wandsworth	99.0	99.5	99.8	99.6	99.5
Westminster	98.4	98.4	98.5	98.4	98.4
<i>Overall Average</i>	98.2	98.5	98.7	98.7	98.5

Table 5 – Local Authority Council Tax Collection in London

	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>Average</b>
Camden	96.3	96.5	96.3	96.3	96.4
Croydon	96.2	97.1	97	97.3	96.9
Ealing	96.8	96.2	96.6	97.3	96.7
Enfield	94.9	95.5	95.7	95.9	95.5
Greenwich	93.1	93.6	94.1	94.3	93.8
Hackney	93.6	94	94.1	94.5	94.1
Hammersmith & Fulham	96.3	96.3	96.3	97	96.5
Haringey	95.1	95.9	95.5	96.2	95.7
Harrow	97.5	97.3	97.4	97.4	97.4
Havering	97.1	97.2	96.8	96.9	97.0
Islington	95.8	95.6	95.6	96.2	95.8
Kensington & Chelsea	97	96.9	97.4	97.4	97.2
Kingston	98.6	98.5	98.9	99	98.8
Lewisham	94.1	94.3	94.5	94.6	94.4
Merton	97.1	97.3	97.5	97.7	97.4
Newham	92.5	94	95.6	96.3	94.6
Redbridge	96.6	97	97.2	97.2	97.0
Richmond	98.8	98.8	98.8	98.6	98.8
Southwark	95	95	95.2	95.9	95.3
Sutton	98.6	98.5	98.6	98.6	98.6
Tower Hamlets	95.4	96.7	96.3	96	96.1
Waltham Forest	95.3	95.8	96	96.1	95.8
Wandsworth	98.3	98.4	98.5	98.6	98.5
<i>Overall Average</i>	96.1	96.4	96.5	96.8	96.4

Table 6 – Local Authority Business Rates Collection in London

	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>Average</b>
Camden	99.4	99.8	99.7	99.0	99.5
Croydon	98.1	98.6	98.6	99.9	98.8
Ealing	95.8	96.3	96.1	97.0	96.3
Enfield	98.8	98.8	98.7	98.8	98.8
Greenwich	97.5	97.8	98.2	98.2	97.9
Hackney	96.2	95.7	95.8	96.6	96.1
Hammersmith & Fulham	97.1	98.1	98.2	98.6	98.0
Haringey	96.7	97.5	98.3	98.4	97.7
Harrow	95.7	96.3	94.1	97.7	96.0
Havering	97.4	97.2	97.7	98.6	97.7
Islington	98.2	96.3	97.0	97.1	97.2
Kingston	97.7	98.2	98.9	98.9	98.4
Lewisham	99.1	99.6	99.7	99.4	99.5
Merton	97.3	97.8	97.7	97.9	97.7
Newham	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.8
Redbridge	97.1	97.7	97.4	98.8	97.8
Richmond	97.2	96.9	98.4	98.1	97.7
Southwark	98.4	98.7	99.5	99.3	99.0
Sutton	97.5	97.1	98.3	98.9	98.0
Tower Hamlets	99.7	99.9	99.6	98.5	99.4
Waltham Forest	95.6	96.9	97.0	97.2	96.7
<i>Overall Average</i>	97.6	97.9	98.0	98.4	98.0

Table 7 – Average London Authority Council Tax Collection 2013 to 2017 and Deprivation

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
Authority Name	Average Collection %	Deprivation Rank	Collection Rank	(C – D)	(E <sup>2</sup> )
Hackney	94.1	1	31	-30	900
Barking and Dagenham	94.7	2	28	-26	676
Tower Hamlets	95.8	3	20	-17	289
Newham	94.6	4	29	-25	625
Islington	95.8	5	21.5	-16.5	272.25
Waltham Forest	95.8	6	21.5	-15.5	240.25
Haringey	95.7	7	23.5	-16.5	272.25
Lambeth	95.0	8	27	-19	361
Southwark	95.3	9	26	-17	289
Lewisham	94.4	10	30	-20	400
<b>Brent</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>-12.5</b>	<b>156.25</b>
Westminster	96.4	12	17.5	-5.5	30.25
Greenwich	93.8	13	32	-19	361
Enfield	95.5	14	25	-11	121
Camden	96.4	15	17.5	-2.5	6.25
Hammersmith & Fulham	96.5	16	15.5	0.5	0.25
Hounslow	97.3	17	8	9	81



<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
Authority Name	Average Collection %	Deprivation Rank	Collection Rank	(C – D)	(E <sup>2</sup> )
Ealing	96.7	18	14	4	16
Croydon	96.9	19	12.5	6.5	42.25
Kensington & Chelsea	97.2	20	9	11	121
Redbridge	97.0	21	10.5	10.5	110.25
Wandsworth	98.5	22	4	18	324
Hillingdon	96.9	23	12.5	10.5	110.25
Barnet	96.3	24	19	5	25
Havering	97.0	25	10.5	14.5	210.25
Bexley	96.5	26	15.5	10.5	110.25
Merton	97.4	27	6.5	20.5	420.25
Harrow	97.4	28	6.5	21.5	462.25
Sutton	98.6	29	3	26	676
Bromley	97.8	30	5	25	625
Kingston	98.8	31	1.5	29.5	870.25
Richmond	98.8	32	1.5	30.5	930.25
					10,134

Chart 1 – Brent Council Tax In-Year Collection Performance



Analysis of London Authorities Collection Performance

An analysis of Tables 1 to 7 and Chart 1 above, indicates the following:

- For Brent Council, Business Rates collection has consistently achieved above the contractual target over the past four years whereas Council Tax has performed below target for the same period;
- For Brent Council, Business Rates collection performance has shown continuous improvement over the past four years;
- For Brent Council, Council Tax collection performance is predominantly characterised by peaks and troughs;
- Brent Council is 0.6% below the overall average collection performance achieved for outsourced *Council Tax* collection services over the past four years and 0.7% for in house service provision;
- Brent Council is 0.3% below the overall average collection performance achieved by outsourced *Business Rates* collection services over the past four years and 0.2% above that achieved for Business Rates in house service provision;
- Outsourced *Business Rates* collection performance is 0.5% above that of in house collection performance based upon the overall average performance for the past four years;
- Outsourced Council Tax collection performance is 0.1% below that of in house collection performance based upon the overall average performance for the past four years. Collection performance had generally improved year on year up until 2016/17. However, reductions in collection performance were reported for 2017/18 at three other London Boroughs with outsourced services.

- There is little comparative information to refer to for collection from shared services in London as the tri-borough arrangement formerly comprising Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham, incorporated various permutations of outsourcing for Westminster and Kensington and Chelsea and in house provision for Hammersmith and Fulham. The oneSource arrangement incorporating Newham and Havering, showed an improved performance in 2016/17 for Havering Business Rates and a consistent performance with 2015/16 for Newham Business Rates. Council Tax collection for both Havering and Newham showed improvement in 2016/17.
- Applying 'Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient' to the data shown in Table 7 above, gives a correlation coefficient of -0.85, suggesting that there is a relatively strong and inversely proportional relationship between deprivation and collection rates in London Authorities (i.e. the higher the level of deprivation, the lower the collection rate achieved).
- Table 7 indicates that the average Council Tax collection achieved by Capita during the period 2013 to 2017 is generally either comparable with or higher than that achieved by authorities experiencing broadly similar or higher levels of deprivation.
- Chart 1 indicates that the Brent Council CTAX collection rate has been characterised by peaks and troughs over the past four years.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Appendix 1E – London Local Authority Revenues and Benefits Services

Local Authority	2010 Elections	2014 Elections	Revenues (I,S,O, JV)	Benefits (I,S,O, JV)
Barking and Dagenham	Labour	Labour	JV–Agilysys	JV–Agilysys
Barnet	Conservative	Conservative	O–Capita	O–Capita
Bexley	Conservative	Conservative	O–Capita	O–Capita
Brent	Labour	Labour	O–Capita	O–Capita
Bromley	Conservative	Conservative	O–Liberata	O–Liberata
Camden	Labour	Labour	I	I
Croydon	Conservative	Labour	I	I
Ealing	Labour	Labour	I	I
Enfield	Labour	Labour	I	I
Greenwich	Labour	Labour	I	I
Hackney	Labour	Labour	I	I
Hammersmith and Fulham	Conservative	Labour	I	I
Haringey	Labour	Labour	I	I
Harrow	No overall control	Labour	I	I
Havering	Conservative	No overall control	S–oneSource	S–oneSource
Hillingdon	Conservative	Conservative	O–Liberata	I

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>2010 Elections</b>	<b>2014 Elections</b>	<b>Revenues (I,S,O, JV)</b>	<b>Benefits (I,S,O, JV)</b>
Hounslow	Labour	Labour	O–Liberata	O–Liberata
Islington	Labour	Labour	I	I
Kensington and Chelsea	Conservative	Conservative	O–Capita (Business Rates) I–(Council Tax)	I
Kingston upon Thames	Liberal Democrat	Conservative	I	I
Lambeth	Labour	Labour	O–Capita	I
Lewisham	Labour	Labour	I	I
Merton	No overall control	Labour	I	I
Newham	Labour	Labour	S–oneSource*	S–oneSource*
Redbridge	No overall control	Labour	I	I
Richmond upon Thames	Conservative	Conservative	I	S-Wandsworth
Southwark	Labour	Labour	I	I
Sutton	Liberal Democrat	Liberal Democrat	I	I
Tower Hamlets	Labour	No overall control	I	I
Waltham Forest	Labour	Labour	I	I
Wandsworth	Conservative	Conservative	I–(Council Tax) O–Liberata (Business Rates)	S–Richmond
Westminster	Conservative	Conservative	O–Capita	O–Capita

(\* = Have served notice to exit the arrangement).

## Appendix 1F – Pretender Considerations

Ref.	Requirement	Response	
(i)	The nature of the service.	The provision of a billing, collection and enforcement service for Business Rates together with associated IT support, printing and customer service.	
(ii)	The estimated value.	£2.8M for the initial five year term and for up to a further three years.	
(iii)	The contract term.	Initial term of five years with an optional extension for up to a further three years at the authority's discretion.	
(iv)	The tender procedure to be adopted.	Competitive procedure with negotiation	
v)	The procurement timetable.	<b>Indicative dates are:</b>	
		Adverts placed	1st March 2018
		Expressions of interest returned	2 <sup>nd</sup> April 2018
		Shortlist drawn up in accordance with the Council's approved criteria	23 <sup>rd</sup> April 2018
		Invite to tender	25 <sup>th</sup> April 2018
		Deadline for tender submissions	20 <sup>th</sup> May 2018
		Panel evaluation and shortlist for interview	17 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
		Interviews and contract decision	17 <sup>th</sup> July 2018
		Report recommending Contract award circulated internally for comment	31 <sup>st</sup> July 2018
		Cabinet approval	11 <sup>th</sup> September 2018

Ref.	Requirement	Response	
		[Cabinet call in period of 5 days (mandatory unless excluded by the Cabinet) OR minimum 10 calendar day standstill period – notification issued to all tenderers and additional debriefing of unsuccessful tenderers (contracts covered by the full EU Regulations only)]	22 <sup>nd</sup> September 2018
		Contract Mobilisation	2 <sup>nd</sup> January 2019
		Contract start date	1 <sup>st</sup> May 2019
(vi)	The evaluation criteria and process.	<p>1. At selection stage shortlists are to be drawn up in accordance with the Council's Contract Procurement and Management Guidelines by the use of a selection questionnaire to identify organisations meeting the Council's financial standing requirements, technical capacity and technical expertise.</p> <p>2. At tender evaluation stage, the panel will evaluate the tenders against the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% price (representing 47.5% for tender price and 2.5% for social value) and 50% quality with the qualitative measures being as follows:</li> </ul> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Staffing Arrangements (including location, recruitment and selection and training and development) and profile over the contract term</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Core IT Systems and Applications, (including any relevant infrastructure, hardware, software, procedures and support)</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Billing, Collection and Enforcement</p>	



Ref.	Requirement	Response
		<p>Organisation and Processes to Maximise the Net Debit and Collection</p> <p>Performance Monitoring, Management Reporting and Statistical Information for Service Delivery</p> <p>Audit, Security and Governance Arrangements</p> <p>Year End and Printing</p> <p>Transition and Exit Arrangements</p> <p>Open Book Arrangements and Change Control</p> <p>Social Value</p> <p>Identification and management of risks (including business continuity planning and disaster recovery)</p>
(vii)	Any business risks associated with entering the contract.	The business risks associated with entering into the service contract in accordance with the recommendations set out within the main report are set out in Appendix H. Financial Services and Legal Services have been consulted concerning this contract and have identified the risks set out within that Appendix.
(viii)	The Council's Best Value duties.	The Council has a duty of Best Value under Section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999. By undertaking a competitive procurement of the service, it is anticipated that achievement of Best Value may be demonstrated.
(ix)	Consideration of Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012	Consideration has been given to the inclusion of Social Value for this procurement and to this extent, a weighting of 5% split between quality 2.5% and price 2.5% is proposed. This is lower than the Brent Council policy of 10% for contracts over £100,000 but as the service is anticipated to be delivered off site and outside of the Borough, the potential social value for Brent Council is lower than would be expected for a contract weighting of 10%.
(x)	Any staffing	See section 5.4 of the report.

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Response</b>
	implications, including TUPE and pensions.	
(xi)	The relevant financial, legal and other considerations.	See sections 5 and 6 of the report.

# Appendix 1G - Revenues and IT Support Service – Future Service Delivery Options

## Equality Analysis Screening Stage

**Department:** Brent Customer Services

**Person Responsible:** Richard Vallis

**Created:** 27<sup>th</sup> September 2017

**Last Review:** Not applicable

**Status:** Open

**Next Review (if applicable):** (see report)

### Stage 1 Screening Data

#### **1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The main objectives of this proposal are:

- To retender the Business Rates service with its associated services as set out in the Cabinet report to ensure that value for money is obtained and to comply with statutory provisions concerning service contracts.
- To return the Council Tax and associated IT services to direct Council provision from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019.

The above are under consideration because the existing contract for the services concerned is scheduled to expire on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019 and there is no further provision for extension of the term.

#### **2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

Capita employees, Brent employees, residents, businesses, suppliers, voluntary and advice agencies.

#### **3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

There is a potential that the proposal could impact on people in different ways although this is currently anticipated to be low. This will be kept under review subject to the Cabinet's decision and as the project progresses to ensure that any potential impact identified is considered and addressed, as appropriate.

#### **3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted**

The proposal is not currently anticipated to have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups.

#### **3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

This is not currently anticipated.

### **3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

No.

### **3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

It is not currently anticipated that this will be the case.

### **3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?**

The proposal relates to the following two equality objectives:

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect
- To develop and sustain a skilled and committed workforce able to meet the needs of all local people.

### **Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?**

Yes, when more information concerning the precise details of the arrangements is available.

### **4. Use the comments box below to give brief details of what further information you will need to complete a Full Equality Analysis. What information will give you a full picture of how well the proposal will work for different groups of people? How will you gather this information? Consider engagement initiatives, research and equality monitoring data.**

A full equality analysis will be carried out when the detailed proposals have been identified. This is the case both in terms of personnel that may transfer to Brent Council under the proposals and those that could potentially transfer to another supplier for delivery of all or part of the services in scope.

In the case of the impact on residents, businesses and other stakeholders, it is currently anticipated that there will be a minimal impact on individuals and groups with protected characteristics. However, for Council Tax and Business Rate payers, the precise details of future service delivery arrangements will not be known until the Cabinet decision is taken and after any tenders have been received and evaluated. A similar position also applies in relation to suppliers currently used by Capita.

Data will be used from the last census, any current monitoring data held concerning local demographics and relevant service data to establish any potential impact on different groups of people. As the proposals relate primarily to back office services, the extent of any potential impact is currently anticipated to be minimal.

## Appendix 1H – Key Risks and Issues

The following key risks and issues have been identified in relation to the recommendations within this report:

### Financial


1. The anticipated cost of the services in the future has been modelled based upon the composition of the existing contract price for 2018/19, an indicative TUPE list received from Capita based upon their staffing arrangements at that time and current Brent Council salary and pension arrangements. Actual prices for the services in scope may therefore differ.
2. There is a possibility that there could be insufficient market interest at the time of inviting interest.
3. Improvements in Council Tax collection may not be achieved without further investment and a higher contract price.
4. There may be some costs and liabilities arising under the exit arrangements from the existing contract that can only be quantified following due diligence being performed.
5. The nature and extent of any financial incentive and deduction scheme related to performance within a future contract may influence the price of tenders received.
6. A contractor may seek to mitigate any financial liability arising from any adverse performance by a Brent service where there is a dependency.

### Staffing

7. The numbers of staff transferring under TUPE has been based upon an indicative TUPE list provided by Capita. The actual number of transferees under TUPE may be different to that anticipated and could result in gaps in niche areas of skills and experience.
8. Service disruption may occur at the end of the existing contract due to the loss of experienced and skilled personnel to other roles and employment.
9. There may be a requirement during any transition period to deploy temporary and agency staff to support the service.
10. The administrative effort required to effectively oversee TUPE transfer arrangements will be influenced by the range and complexity of differing terms and conditions that transferring staff may have.

Administrative

11. There is less flexibility with a contracted service to effectively control and develop it in conjunction with other Brent Council services and projects.

	<p align="center"><b>Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee</b> 14 March 2019</p>
	<p align="center"><b>Report from the Director of Performance, Policy and Partnerships</b></p>
<p><b>Recycling in flats</b></p>	

<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Key or Non-Key Decision:</b>	Key
<b>Open or Part/Fully Exempt:</b>	Open
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	0
<b>Background Papers:</b>	None
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Pascoe Sawyers, Head of Strategy and Partnerships, <a href="mailto:pascoe.sawyers@brent.gov.uk">pascoe.sawyers@brent.gov.uk</a> 020 8937 1045

## 1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1 The report provides clarification of the council's recycling service, current challenges with regards to increasing recycling and what steps are being taken to develop the best possible recycling service for our residents. It also provides clarification on the barriers to recycling in flats and the initiatives that are being undertaken to increase recycling in these properties

## 2.0 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee are to note and comment on the contents of the report.

## 3.0 Detail

- 3.1 The report details recycling rates achieved since the new Veolia contract in 2014/15. Comparisons are shown with other London Boroughs within the West London Waste Authority for 2017/18 only.

- 3.2 There are a number of challenges to recycling such as the high proportion of blocks of flats, the transient nature of living, English not being a first language, and difficulties of access for residents living in flats above shops.
- 3.3 Whilst the recycling rates vary across the 6 West London Boroughs, the demographics and housing stock of our comparators are vastly different. Only Hounslow has a similar issue in terms of high turnover of residents, language challenges and a high proportion of residents living in blocks of flats.
- 3.4 The report looks at solutions to these barriers and also production of Reduction and Recycling Plan to be ready by Dec 2019 GLA sign-off.

#### **4.0 Financial Implications**

- 4.1 As set out in the report

#### **5.0 Legal Implications**

- 5.1 As set out in the report

#### **6.0 Equality Implications**

- 6.1 As set out in the report

***REPORT SIGN-OFF***

***Peter Gadsdon***

Director Performance, Policy and Partnerships





**Resources and Public Realm  
Scrutiny Committee**  
14 March 2019

**Report from the Strategic Director  
of Regeneration and Environment**

**Update on initiatives to reduce barriers and increase recycling in flats and flats and above shops**

<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Key or Non-Key Decision:</b> (only applicable for Cabinet, Cabinet Sub Committee and officer decisions)	N/A
<b>Open or Part/Fully Exempt:</b> (If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)	Open
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	Nil
<b>Background Papers:</b>	N/A
<b>Contact Officer(s):</b> (Name, Title, Contact Details)	Kelly Eaton, Policy, Projects and Support Manager <a href="mailto:Kelly.eaton@brent.gov.uk">Kelly.eaton@brent.gov.uk</a>

**1.0 Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1. This report provides clarification of the council's recycling service, current challenges with regards to increasing recycling and what steps are being taken to develop the best possible recycling service for our residents. In October 2011, Brent expanded its recycling provision to Brent residents, by changing the collection containers from a small green box, to a 240 Litre blue topped recycling bin, which allowed for a much greater amount of household items to be recycled by residents. This scheme was introduced to all street level properties; which includes all houses, maisonettes, flat conversions and small blocks of flats which have under 8 properties. Recycling was already in place in some blocks of flats by means of communal bins. However, external funding was obtained in 2012; which allowed us to introduce communal recycling bins into all blocks of flats. Further external funding was obtained in 2013, which allowed the council to provide communal food waste recycling to all blocks of flats; making us one of the first authorities in the country, and certainly the first in London to have food waste available to all blocks of flats, irrespective of the size of the block.
- 1.2. This report provides clarification on the barriers to recycling in flats and the initiatives that are being undertaken to increase recycling in these properties.

## 2.0 Recommendations

2.1 That members of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee note the contents of this progress report.

## 3.0 Detail

3.1 In 2014 a new waste collection contract was entered into between the Council and Veolia Environmental Services. This contract was designated as an output based contract; whereby there was no target set for a recycling rate to be achieved. Instead the contractor took responsibility to reduce the amount of household waste being sent to landfill; which as of 2017 is now all being sent to an Energy from Waste Facility in Bristol. To aid Veolia in meeting this obligation, responsibility for all communications and education to residents (other than the councils web pages), was transferred to the contractor. Although the contract is output based and now monitored on tonnage; the council still reports a recycling rate to Waste Data Flow, which allows for national and local comparison of recycling rates achieved annually.

3.2 The figures below highlight the recycling rates achieved since the new Veolia contract in 2014/15. The figures demonstrate our recycling rate based on waste collected directly from households.

2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
35.21%	35.80%	36.40%	36.50%

3.3 A comparison is show in the table below, with other London Boroughs within the West London Waste Authority for 2017/18 only.

Brent	Ealing	Harrow	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond
36.5%	48.8%	41%	40%	29.8%	41.9%

3.4 Whilst the recycling rates vary across the 6 West London Borough's, the demographics and housing stock of our comparators are vastly different. Only Hounslow has a similar issue in terms of high turnover of residents, language challenges and a high proportion of residents living in blocks of flats. Residents in Ealing and Richmond tend not to move very often and generally live in houses rather than flats, making education and communication much less challenging.

3.5 Comparison with boroughs outside of West London Waste Authority with similar demographics and property stock to Brent however, show that we are achieving a good recycling rate; with Redbridge residents recycling 23.9% and Tower Hamlets recycling 26.4%.

3.6 To offer further clarification the actual tonnages of household waste for the last four years for Brent are as follows:

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
<b>Recycling Tonnage</b>	18148	21849	21214	21979
<b>Garden Waste/Food Tonnage</b>	15897	12212	12935	12762
<b>General Waste Tonnage</b>	58968	57645	58584	57231

#### 4.0 Factors and challenges affecting recycling from flats in Brent

- 4.1 **Challenge 1: Recycling in Blocks of flats.** Over 50% of Brent's housing stock are flats, and this figure is increasing continuously. Communal recycling poses challenges; as there is no one individual to take responsibility for placing incorrect items into communal bins. Any bins that are considered as contaminated with the incorrect items can only be collected as general waste, because there is a lesser likelihood of anyone taking responsibility for the removal of incorrect items.
- 4.2 **Solution:** Veolia have recently completely redesigned the annual education leaflet and collection calendar, which is due for distribution to all street level properties in March 2019. In addition, however, they have also produced a new education leaflet for residents in blocks of flats, residents who live along the North Circular Road and all residents in Flats above Shops; with tailored leaflets depending on whether the property is in a timed collections area. All properties in Brent therefore, for the first time ever, will be receiving a leaflet about their collection service in March this year. Leaflets to properties that are not street level have previously only received information if an education officer has to visit them because of a highlighted issue of concern. This is a comprehensive pro-active approach to education for all Brent residents.
- 4.3 Veolia's education team also have a flats recycling project underway; which has been in place for the last year and will be continuing for the coming year. After a few trials of different methods, a creative approach to increasing recycling at flats has been developed. Any block of flats that are identified as having issues with contaminated recycling bins are visited by the team. Education is carried out to residents; with the support of the managing agent where possible. Then note is taken of the number of bins. Blocks of flats have historically had more general waste bins than recycling bins and our policy is to charge managing agents for any new bins. However, now, where possible, recycling bins are separated from general waste bins to reduce the possibility of contamination. In addition, general waste bins are swapped for recycling bins, increasing the number of recycling bins at a given location. There is no charge made to the managing agent for this swap and refurbished recycling bins are provided. This is an incentive for managing agents as additional bins, both for general waste and recycling incur a charge of nearly £400 per bin. This is followed up with further education to make the residents aware of the change and to encourage them to recycle more. So far 62 blocks of flats have been part of this innovative project and contamination in communal recycling bins has been shown to drop

following direct intervention, based on visual inspections of bin content and consistent collections of recycling bins by the collection operatives.

- 4.4 **Challenge 2: Transience and properties with small external space.** High transition of residents is also a factor in Brent that affects whether people are resident in the borough for long enough to engage fully with our services. Highly transient residents tend to live in Flats above Shops and blocks of flats. Other factors that affect full engagement with the recycling and waste services are whether a property is a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) or a flat above a shop. HMO's pose challenges due to the number of people in a property producing waste, which has to be balanced against the space in a front garden for a recommended number of bins. Flats above shops have designated areas on the public highway or in a service road where they can place their waste for collection.
- 4.5 **Solution:** Neighbourhood Managers work closely with colleagues who manage the landlord licencing scheme to hold landlords to account for the provision of the correct number of bins (where space allows at a property). For those residents who live in a Flat above a Shop, timed collections offer a comprehensive twice a day, 7 days a week collection service for those living in directly above our high streets.
- 4.6 **Challenge 3: English as a second language.** Given the diverse range of Brent residents, language can also be a potential barrier to understanding what materials can be recycled.
- 4.7 **Solution:** Veolia is working to improve the visual aspect of their communications and education material to ensure that the message is as visual as possible, with clear 'Yes' and 'No' messages regarding certain materials. All communications material for 2019 will be in a clear visual format. A sample of a leaflet for residents living in a flat above a shop is attached in Appendix 1.
- 4.8 **Challenge 4: Access to recycling facilities for resident living in Flats above Shops.** Residents have advised the service that they have found it difficult to order recycling bags. Further investigation also highlighted an issue with recycling bags being delivered to communal doorways of properties and then allegedly being used by businesses rather than residents.
- 4.9 **Solution:** Flats above Shops recycling has been developed with a year-long trial in Harlesden Library. The trial allowed for a stock of recycling bags to be made freely available to residents who live in in Flats above Shops in the local area through the provision of a collection point at the Library. The library has confirmed that residents are taking these bags; and Veolia have been refilling the supplies at the Library, which has led to the creation of a permanent offering of the provision of recycling bags, for those who live in flats above shops, in all libraries across Brent.

- 4.10 In addition, a new online form has been developed, which makes it even easier for residents in Flats above shops to request recycling bags for delivery. Veolia also are looking into flat pack options for recycling bags so they can more easily be posted through resident's doors.

## **5.0 The Way Forward**

- 5.1 One recent success has been that Brent was selected by Resource London in early 2019, to receive £8000 worth of recycling communications via a targeted Facebook video advert. The communications method will clarify four key materials which can be recycled and four key materials which can't; with the aim of increasing recycling across the borough. We will be monitoring its effect with Resource London after its launch, which is due to take place in March 2019.
- 5.2 A recent review of Veolia's communications and education methodology has led to a change in process. Recycling stickers will be sent out with all letters set to residents who are identified as having the wrong items in their recycling bin which have prevented collection on at a least one occasion. The sticker will provide an easy reminder they can stick on top of their own recycling bin to assist them get it right every time.
- 5.3 Food waste is the heaviest item in general waste. Removing this from general waste bins would greatly assist in reducing the tonnage sent to Energy from Waste and also impact on the recycling rate. Steps to make this happen include a refresh of the communal food waste collection service, with delivery of food waste bags to residents in blocks of flats when targeted education is carried out by the Veolia team. In addition, Brent was the first West London borough to be supported by West London Waste Authority in the delivery of a project which looked at various methods to increase food waste recycling. This project demonstrated that residents respond well to direct messages on their bins. As a result, Veolia are looking to consider the placing of 'No Food Waste' stickers onto general waste bins, to encourage residents to use the separate food waste service.
- 5.4 The innovative Recycleopedia app is being promoted in all of our service leaflets and is now consistently receiving over 7,000 searches every month from residents; seeking to place their household waste in the correct bin. Brent was the first borough in London to support this search facility for our residents.
- 5.5 There is a large amount of development taking place in Brent at the moment. Thousands of new properties; mainly flats are being built every year. Most new properties surrounding Wembley Stadium are due to be on the Envac disposal system and their waste will not be included in any recycling tonnage for the borough. However new developments in Kilburn, Alperton and Stonebridge will be contributing to the household waste tonnages. Waste collection will be monitored closely at newly built blocks with the aim of encouraging residents to place the correct items in the correct bins right from the start of their tenancy.

- 5.6 Whilst recycling is important and certainly an option that we are encouraging Brent residents to wholeheartedly participate in, it is also the third option on the Waste Hierarchy. This states that the options for managing waste should firstly be to reduce, then reuse and then recycle. This is also supported by the Mayor of London's Environment Plan. A long term aim of the service is to encourage residents not only to reduce the amount of waste they produce, but also to look at ways of reusing household items they currently have. Veolia's education team and the Neighbourhood Management Team will be working closely together in the coming year, to make reuse a reality for Brent residents.
- 5.7 The Mayor's Environment Plan was produced in May 2018. It sets out four key objectives:
- Objective 7.1** - Drive resource efficiency to significantly reduce waste focusing on food waste and single use packaging  
**Objective 7.2** – Maximise recycling rates  
**Objective 7.3** - Reduce the environmental impact of waste activities (greenhouse gas emissions and air pollutants)  
**Objective 7.4** - Maximise local waste sites and ensure London has sufficient infrastructure to manage all the waste it produces
- 5.8 All London boroughs are required to produce a Reduction and Recycling Plan (RRP) by December 2019, to be signed off by the GLA shortly afterwards. The plans were required to be produced in 3 phases by all London Boroughs; with Brent being recognised by the GLA as being in the final phase because we are seen as an authority who meet and exceed the Mayors requirement to offer a minimum level of recycling provision to our residents. Brent enables its residents to recycle all possible materials, provides a separate food waste service; including to those in blocks of flats, and a separate garden waste service. Our task when setting our targets for the RRP, which will be signed off by the GLA later this year, is to demonstrate how the improvements and projects contained within this report, can lead to a greater recycling rate, contribute to the overall London recycling target of 50% by 2025 and reduce the amount of waste being sent to WLWA's Energy from Waste facility.

## **6.0 Financial Implications**

6.1 None

## **7.0 Legal Implications**

7.1 None

## **8.0 Equality Implications**

8.1 None

# Appendix 1: Timed Collections Service Leaflet 2019

## Bulky waste

For £35 we will collect up to five bulky items such as furniture, large electrical items and carpets. Book a collection at [brent.gov.uk/specialcollections](http://brent.gov.uk/specialcollections) or call 020 8937 5050.

Please place items booked for collection on the pavement as near to 7am as possible and do not obstruct the footpath. Alternatively, you can take bulky items to the Reuse and Recycling Centre on Abbey Road, NW10 7TJ. If you receive certain benefits, your first collection is free.

**✓ YES PLEASE**



Bulky items including fridges, sofas, furniture etc.

Timed Collections

## Your recycling and waste service



To order recycling bags - see page 4

## Quick Questions

### What happens to my recycling and waste?

Your recycling is sent to be separated and sold on to manufacturers to make new products. Your general waste is sent for energy recovery to power homes.

### How can I get my recycling bags?

You can collect direct from the libraries below:  
 Ealing Road Library HA0 4BA  
 Harlesden Library Plus NW10 8SE  
 Kilburn Library NW6 6NN  
 Kingsbury Library NW9 9HE  
 The Library at Willesden Green NW10 2SF  
 Or order them online at [brent.gov.uk/fastrecycling](http://brent.gov.uk/fastrecycling)


### Can I leave large items on the pavement?

Not without arranging a special collection, otherwise it's fly-tipping. That's a criminal offence and you could be fined at least £400.

4

Printed on 100% recycled paper.





working in partnership

## Recycling

### ✓ YES PLEASE

What to include in your clear recycling bag



Food tins, drink caps, aerosols and clean foil



Plastic bottles, clean containers, pots and food trays



Paper, cardboard and food and drink cartons



Glass bottles and jars (including lids)

- Please rinse containers
- If in doubt, leave it out!

### X NO THANKS



Black sacks, plastic bags and film



Food or garden waste



Textiles or electrical items



Nappies, crisp packets and sweet wrappers

### ! Make sure your bags get collected

Placing wrong items in your recycling means your bags will not be collected until you remove the wrong items. Processing wrong items also costs many thousands of pounds annually and prevents Brent from recycling more as ruined recycling needs to be collected as general waste. If in doubt, leave it out or check with our recycling app below.

Download Brent's Recyclepedia app for more information on what you can and can't recycle or visit [brent.gov.uk/recyclepedia](http://brent.gov.uk/recyclepedia)

## Recyclepedia

## General

### ✓ YES PLEASE

What to include in your general waste bag



Plastic bags and film



Nappies



Pet litter



Plastic wrapping, film and crisp packets

### X NO THANKS



Wood or bulkier materials



Textiles



Electrical items



Recycling

good to know

### Where and when should I put my bags out?

- To keep your street clean, you must only place your recycling and waste bags out for collection half an hour before your confirmed collection times.
- Your collection times can be found online at [brent.gov.uk/recycling](http://brent.gov.uk/recycling) or on nearby street signs.
- Please secure your recycling and waste using durable bags tied in a knot to prevent spillage, making sure your bags do not obstruct the pathway.

### ! Enforcement

If you put your recycling or waste out for collection at any other times than stated, you could receive a fine. If this is unpaid, legal proceedings will be filed against you. Our Enforcement Team work hard to ensure timed collections are followed to keep Brent clean and safe.

Check your collection times online at [brent.gov.uk/recycling](http://brent.gov.uk/recycling) or on nearby street signs

These items can be taken to the Reuse and Recycle Centre on Abbey Road, NW10 7TJ.

Use your recycling bag.

2 [brent.gov.uk/recyclepedia](http://brent.gov.uk/recyclepedia)

[brent.gov.uk/recycling](http://brent.gov.uk/recycling)

3

Page 67

**This page is intentionally left blank**