

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 22 June 2004	MEETING NAME Executive
Report title:		Integrated Cleaning Contract – First Year Review	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure Strategic Director of Housing	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Members note the progress and performance of the Integrated Cleaning Contract and Southwark Cleaning.
2. Members consider the options for future service delivery arrangements and agree that the current service delivery arrangements be continued for a further 3 years subject to satisfactory performance and an annual review.
3. Members request officers to convey the Executive's decision for future service delivery arrangements to Tenants Council and Leaseholders Council and discuss with both bodies annual improvement plans.
4. Members note the proposal for Southwark to lead a benchmarking group over the next year.

BACKGROUND

5. In April 2002 the cleanliness of Southwark's streets and estates was far from satisfactory. This fact was borne out in the resident's survey of 2002, which identified street cleaning as the third most important issue for residents (37%). This combined with a low net satisfaction level and the fact that cleaner streets/environment came top (31%) of resident's lists when asked which services need most improvement in their area meant that significant improvements needed to be made.
6. A range of factors had combined to produce this situation:
 - Street Cleaning and Estate Cleaning was delivered by six different, (four external and two internal), contractors undertaking works in specific areas of the borough creating demarcation.
 - Contracts were very old, out of date and no longer relevant to the needs of the borough. Additionally there was little emphasis on quality.
 - Contracts were not let to uniform service standards resulting in different parts of the borough receiving different standards of service.
 - Contractors would clean only what was in their specification and residents could literally see a contractor cleaning one side of the road but not the other.
 - The borough was facing increasing volumes of litter, dumping and fly tipping.
 - Management capacity within the existing contract teams had been limited both in terms of resource levels and expertise
 - It was recognised that the previous contracts were under-resourced to meet the Council's aspirations for a Cleaner and Greener environment across the borough.
7. Between September and December 2003, council officers drafted a detailed specification setting out high output standards aimed at delivering top quartile performance in terms of borough cleanliness. This specification was put before Members for approval on 21st November 2002.

8. On 17 December 2002 the executive also decided that in order to make a rapid step change in standards, this service would be provided internally for one year with a review process at the end of this period to assess the effectiveness of the new arrangements.
9. The standards in this new specification are appended at **Appendix One**

PERFORMANCE 2003/04

Quantitative

10. As part of the creation of the Integrated Cleaning Contract stringent performance measurement tools were put in place to ensure the service delivered what it was established to do. **Table 1** below sets out the performance indicator targets set at the start of 2003/04 and the actual performance achieved. As can be seen, almost every target has been met or exceeded. Particular reference needs to be made to the out turn figure of 34 for the Local Environmental Quality Standard (BVPI 199). This indicator is a measure of how the Council is performing in terms of borough wide cleanliness and is externally validated. The performance for 2003/04 places Southwark joint 5th in terms of Cleanliness in London boroughs.

Table 1

	2002/03	2003/04	
Indicator	Actual	Target	Actual
Service Quality Performance Indicators			
Average number of highways of a high and acceptable standard	71	90	92
% of fly-tips removed within 24 hours of notification	74	95	96.4
% of other graffiti removed within 24 hours of notification	71	95	97
BVPI 199 – Local Environmental Quality Standard (LEQs)	N/A	36	34
Contract Compliance Performance Indicators			
Number of rectifications issued per calendar month	75	15	7
Number of default points issued per calendar month	22	5	0

Qualitative

11. As outlined previously in this report a main driver for the creation of an Integrated Cleaning Contract was recognition that residents consistently identified borough cleanliness as a key concern and that the cleanliness of streets/environment needed most improvement in their area.
12. One year on, the public's perception of the service has improved significantly. A number of surveys have taken place to gauge this change.
13. **Table 2** below set out tenants' and leaseholders' views that were expressed during consultation carried out by the Housing Department in August 2003. The consultation process centred on Tenants and Resident Associations and asked specific questions about areas of the service and questions on whether the service was an improvement or not on previous arrangements.

Table 2

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Graffiti Removal	25%	26%	45%	2%	2%
Bulk Removal	32%	32%	29%	5%	2%
Fly Tipping	19%	12%	50%	15%	4%
Internal Block Cleaning	20%	41%	28%	8%	2%
External Block Cleaning	31%	33%	25%	11%	0%
Cleaning Weekdays	43%	24%	26%	7%	0%
Cleaning Weekends	30%	25%	30%	15%	0%
G/M (Grass Cutting, Shrubs, etc)	17%	27%	29%	22%	5%

14. In terms of overall perception 84% of Tenants and Residents Associations thought cleaning on estates was much improved or improved since the inception of the new service delivery arrangements and 61% thought Grounds Maintenance was much improved or improved.
15. Additionally, follow-up presentations have been made to Neighbourhood Forums, Tenant Council and Leaseholder Council during the early part of 2004. Generally the response from tenants and leaseholders remains positive and it is expected that this will be confirmed in a further year-end survey that is currently being undertaken.
16. Consultation on satisfaction with the new service arrangements with borough residents as a whole has also been undertaken, informally at Community Councils and through an additional resident satisfaction survey. **Table 3** sets out the available results of the informal satisfaction survey with Community Councils.
17. Each Community Council is being asked whether they think the borough has got cleaner, stayed the same or got dirtier in the last 12 months.

Table 3

Community Council	Cleaner	No change	Dirtier
Walworth	88%	12%	0%
Camberwell	24%	40%	36%
Bankside	90%	10%	0%
Rotherhithe	84%	16%	0%
Bermondsey	80%	15%	5%
Peckham			
Dulwich			
Nunhead			

18. The results of the informal surveys undertaken at Community Council's demonstrate that on the whole residents (73%) believe that over the last year the borough has got cleaner. However, the results for Camberwell Community Council identify an area that requires action. To address this officers are currently reviewing cleaning arrangements for the area and will amending resource allocation and frequencies of activity to endeavour to ensure the services delivered match that demanded by residents.

19. The results of the most recent resident satisfaction survey shows that the net satisfaction with Street Cleanliness has improved by 14% (33% to 47%) compared to the survey undertaken in 2002. This marked improvement bears out anecdotal evidence that the standards being delivered by the new service arrangements are starting to meet the levels demanded by residents of the borough.

Value for money

20. Whilst the improvements in both quantitative and qualitative performance measures are clearly detailed above, it is important that value for money is demonstrated. To this end two sets of benchmarking has been undertaken; one with other London boroughs and one through a benchmarking club facilitated by an organisation called APSE (Association of Public Service Excellence).

21. London boroughs are a natural comparator group for Southwark in terms of benchmarking costs for street cleaning and as the information provided by APSE does not include London Boroughs to show broad comparisons **Table 4** below provides approximate annual street cleaning (not including estates – see paragraph 26) budgets for a number of London Boroughs. Also included where available is the externally validated BVPI 199 performance data.

Table 4

	Annual Budget 2003/04 (£,000)	Variance from Southwark (%)	Performance (LEQs) 2003/04
Southwark	6,700	-	34
Lambeth	8,500	+27%	34
Lewisham	5,489	-18%	34
Islington	6,100	-9%	36
Westminster	19,000	+184%	20
Tower Hamlets	7,586	+13%	34
Haringey	5,100	-24%	47
Newham	8,880	+33%	
Camden	10,340	+36%	

22. More detailed benchmarking to assess the cost effectiveness of the service a has been undertaken through APSE (Association of Public Service Excellence). APSE has 122 local authorities as members and provides comparative data on how efficient and effective a council's cleaning service is operating. The quartile results are therefore National.

23. **Table 5** below sets out summary information for Southwark against a comparator group of 10 similar authorities. It should be noted that only one other London authority is a member of APSE and the information provided by APSE does not compare Southwark with all 122 authorities and therefore has its limitations.

Table 5

Note	Indicator	Quartile (2002/03)	Quartile (2003/04)
A	Percentage of roads clean to an acceptable standard	Bottom	2 nd
B	BVPI 199 - Local Environment Quality Standard	N/A	Not known
C	Staff absence (front line staff)	N/A	Top
D	Number of litter bins per 1,000 Head of Population	3 rd	Top
E	Cost per KM cleaned (frequency based)	2 nd	2 nd
F	Cost of service per head of population	Bottom	Bottom
G	KM cleaned per FTE Employee (frequency based)	2 nd	2 nd

H	Quality Assurance and Community Consultation	N/A	Top
I	Human Resources and People Management	N/A	Top
J	Non-availability of vehicles requested	3 rd	Top
K	No. of litter offence FPN's issued	3 rd	Top

Explanatory notes for **Table 4**

- A. Percentage of roads that scored Grade 'A' or Grade 'B' when inspected
- B. New BVPI externally assessed by EnCAMS as mentioned in paragraph '8' earlier
- C. Not known for 2002/03 as staff were managed by external contractors
- D. An additional 1200 litter bins were deployed in 2003/04
- E. This demonstrates staff productivity as it takes into account the amount of times each road in the borough is swept and compares this with the number of sweepers allocated
- F. This shows that it is very expensive to clean an inner city borough such as Southwark. We are in the lowest quartile as indicators compare councils from across the country
- G. Another measure of staff productivity
- H. Figures for 2002/03 not available as the service was provided externally. It is a measure of how we consult with stakeholders and consider quality of service as a driver.
- I. Figures for 2002/03 not available as the service was provided externally. It is a measure of how we treat our staff.
- J. The use of leased new, vehicles has improved reliability considerably.
- K. This reflects the level of enforcement activity undertaken
24. The information contained in table 5 details that whilst the cost of keeping Southwark clean is fairly high per head of population, the cost of cleaning per kilometre is relatively low. This demonstrates that the amount of times each road is swept in Southwark is significantly greater than the authorities in Southwark's APSE comparator group, which when taking into consideration the characteristics of an inner London authority is reasonable.
25. In addition the benchmarking data obtained from APSE places Southwark above average in terms of cleansing performance. When this is considered in the context of an inner London borough compared to a national comparator group shows the significant improvements that have been made.
26. With regard to a London perspective as outlined in paragraph 9, Southwark's BVPI199 out turn for 2003/04 of 34 places it joint 5th in London in terms of an externally validated borough cleanliness assessment and well above the London average of 39.
27. Table 4 provides details of nine London borough's approximate street cleaning budget and their 2003/04 BVPI199 scores. It can be seen that Southwark's budget of £6.7 Million is less than the average street cleaning budget of £7.37 Million discounting Westminster.
28. It is regrettably very difficult to obtain comparative data for the estates cleaning part of the Integrated Cleaning Contract due to the unique approach of Southwark. However, it is intended to initiate a Southwark Council led benchmarking process for the Integrated Cleaning Contract in its entirety over the coming six months.

DELIVERING THE CHANGE

29. To deliver the change demonstrated in this report, the Waste Management Division and Southwark Cleaning, in conjunction with Southwark Housing, have concentrated on four key areas:
- Strong Contract Management
 - Number of Operatives
 - Allocation of Resources

- Enhanced Management and Supervision

Strong Contract Management

30. A strong client function and stringent contract management has remained at the heart of the service and the strong partnership approach with Housing has been a key aspect of the first year's success. The first year of operation has seen management of the contract evolve considerably. Monthly contractor review meetings discuss operational issues and problem solving which includes amending operational schedules and resource allocation as and when required.
31. A quarterly contract review board consisting of the Strategic Directors of Environment & Leisure and Housing plus senior officers from both departments assesses how the service is developing against its strategic aims both in terms of performance outputs and financial efficiency.
32. In addition to these formal meetings, daily, informal contacts between Southwark Cleaning and Neighbourhood Housing staff take place to resolve issues at the front line.
33. Further enhancements to the contract management structure are planned to formalise the client contractor relationship between stakeholders, notably Southwark Housing, and Southwark Cleaning.

Number of operatives

34. Additional resources were needed to deliver the higher specification. **Table 6** below sets out how the number of operatives has increased over the last twelve months.
35. The number of staff is constantly under review and has moved considerably during the first year of operation. For example the number of estate fly tip teams which was increased 5 to 16 at the commencement of the contract and now has reduced to 12 as need has diminished.
36. In addition the service was 'front loaded' in order to make the necessary step change in borough cleanliness. This 'front loading', having served its purpose, was replaced with the planned staffing levels at the end of August 2003.

Table 6

March 2003	March 2004
125 Street Cleaners	221 Street Cleaners
290 Estate Cleaners	428 Estate Cleaners
40 Gardeners	78 Gardeners
5 Estate Fly Tip Lorries	12 Estate Fly Tip Lorries
6 Street Fly Tip Lorries	18 Street Fly Tip Lorries
3 Graffiti Teams	8 Graffiti Teams

Resource Allocation

37. Whilst increasing the level of resources in a service area will obviously create improvements, how the resources are allocated is probably more fundamental to achieving real improvements that can be sustained. The three main areas that make up the service provided under the Integrated Cleaning Contract; Street Cleaning, Estate Cleaning and Grounds Maintenance are very different and have seasonal characteristics and as such require very different operational plans.

38. To this end during the first year of operation the operational plans for all areas have been under constant development. An operational summary of each area is outlined below, however, it should be noted whilst the principles have remained the same the actual frequencies of operations have altered to ensure that desired outputs have been achieved.

Street Cleaning

39. The operational plan for street cleaning is based on providing a visible, accountable presence both in shopping areas and residential roads. The plan provides a seven-day service using single barrow operatives for residential roads with a mixture of single barrow operatives, mechanical sweepers and teams of sweepers where applicable to cover the more heavily trafficked areas. The plan is based on the utilisation of a considerably increased level of labour resources, approximately 63%, and provides a cleaning presence on Southwark 24 hours a day 7 days a week.

Estate Cleaning

40. The operational plan for Estate Cleaning is based on the principle of estate management. This is delivering ownership and accountability for operatives. Each Neighbourhood has a team of cleaners assigned to it. These cleaners report to a dedicated Supervisor and are further split into estate-based teams that clean the Council's housing estates seven days per week. Close joint working by these teams with neighbourhood staff has produced noticeable improvements in the following areas:

- The cleaning of communal areas internally to blocks of flats and externally to service roads, paths, play areas and landscaped areas.
- The speedy removal of bulk furniture and fly-tipping from communal areas
- The immediate removal of graffiti on housing estates

Grounds Maintenance

41. The delivery of grounds maintenance is more specialised and requires specialist plant and equipment therefore the delivery has an area focus. Two distinct sets of teams are in place, looking after grass cutting and shrub bed maintenance. Ten teams are responsible for grass cutting and twelve look after the shrub beds. Similar joint working with Housing has seen significant improvements in standards of maintenance of landscaped areas on estates including shrubberies, flower beds and grassed areas

Enhanced Management and Supervision

42. As part of the development of new service provider, Southwark Cleaning, it was felt that the key to success was to have more people pushing brooms and more people, pushing the people, pushing brooms. As a result a new-dedicated manager and management team has been established that not only provides an area focus but also mirrors the Housing Management service delivery arrangements.

43. Daily contact between the Southwark Cleaning management team and Housing has proved very successful and has created an ethos of local problem resolution and encourages a feeling of partnership working.

44. Sufficient resourcing plus the 'can-do' culture of Southwark Cleaning has also freed up Housing monitoring staff to make more qualitative and strategic decisions on environmental issues relating to the Council's estates.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

45. The draft final accounts for 2003/04 shows that the net cost of operating Southwark Cleaning was £17.5m compared to a budget of £15.3m. The original budget of £15.3m was developed from a model established against a draft specification. The model whilst comprehensive needed to be considerably reviewed before the new service arrangements commenced.
46. As a result of the comprehensive review process, prior to the commencement of the new service arrangements the specification was significantly amended both in terms of additional works and volumes and frequencies of activity. In addition operational methodologies used to construct the funding model were amended to ensure that the new arrangements were able to deliver exactly what was required.
47. The increases in costs that resulted from variations to the initial specification in terms of additional works, amendments to volumes and frequencies and agreed changes to operational methodologies and have been met through existing departmental budgets.
48. The variations of £2.2m were formally agreed by the respective clients, Environment & Leisure and Housing and have been administered in accordance with the contract requirements.
49. Costs of delivering the Integrated Cleaning Contract are clearly split between General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account. A recent audit of Southwark Cleaning accounts by Price Waterhouse Coopers found that the accounts have been prepared on an actual cost basis against the revised specification. In addition the audit concluded that split between Housing Revenue Account and General Fund is clear and accurate.
50. **Table 7** below details the final accounts of Southwark Cleaning for 2003/04.

Table 7 – Final Accounts for Southwark Cleaning 2003/04

	Original Budget			Agreed Variations			Final Accounts 03/04		
	HRA £'000	General Fund £'000	Total £'000	HRA £'000	General Fund £'000	Total £'000	HRA £'000	General Fund £'000	Total £'000
Street Cleaning <i>Adhoc Income</i>	0	5,384	5,384	0	1,100	1,100	0	6,678 -194	6,678 -194
Estate Cleaning <i>Adhoc Income</i>	8,042		8,042	1,123	0	1,123	9,311 -145		9,311 -145
Grounds Maintenance <i>Adhoc Income</i>	1,630	244	1,874	0	0	0	1,793 -164	273 -28	2,066 -192
Total	9,672	5,628	15,300	1,123	1,100	2,223	10,795	6,729	17,524

51. The costs of the agreed variations for street cleaning were included within the base budget for 2003/04.
52. The total cost of operating the contract in year two, outlined in **table 8**, is expected to be around £18m and sufficient provision has been made both in Housing Revenue Account and General Fund budgets to cover this expenditure. Any efficiency savings made during the year will be returned to the respective client, as Southwark Cleaning is not required to make any surplus.

Table 8

Budget 04/05

	HRA	General Fund	Total
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Street Cleaning		6,708	6,708
Estate Cleaning	9,297		9,297
Grounds Maintenance	1,686	254	1,940
			-
Est total cost 03/04	10,983	6,962	17,945

53. The costs chargeable to the HRA are recovered from tenants and leaseholders via service charges. Any savings returned to the HRA will be reflected in actual service charge bills charged to leaseholders for 2004/05 and will be taken in to account in setting 2005/06 service charges to tenants.

CONCLUSIONS

54. The first year of operation of Southwark Cleaning has delivered some considerable performance improvements and some very valuable learning for all involved. However, it must be recognised that this is only the start and that the standards achieved not only need to be sustained but also built upon and integrated into a more overarching strategy for improving cleanliness standards.

55. In June 2004, a Corporate Performance Assessment (CPA) will take place. This is to be followed in September by a review centred on borough cleanliness. A positive assessment could assist Southwark's objective of moving its assessment from 'Fair' to 'Good' so it is vital that the progress made to date is built upon.

56. Consequently a comprehensive Borough Cleanliness Improvement Plan is being produced for 2004/05. The plan will be used to shape the next twelve months work for the three key strands - Service Delivery, Education and Awareness Raising and Enforcement and will further the integration between Environment & Leisure and Housing.

INTEGRATED CLEANING CONTRACT – THE FUTURE

57. Whilst the integrated cleaning contract in its first year of operation has been a success future service delivery arrangements need to be considered as part of this first year review.

58. As outlined earlier in this report the decision to bring the management of the Integrated Cleaning Contract within the Council was to be reviewed after 12 months. Members need to consider the options available for future service delivery arrangements.

Option 1

Continued in house provision with regular review mechanisms

Advantages

- Clear accountability
- Flexible service delivery
- Primary driver – quality
- No profit requirement
- Clear commitment to Council priorities
- Joined up with other service areas
- Actual Based costing

Disadvantages

- Council retains operational & financial risk
- Staff management – Council issue
- Local authority terms and conditions

Option 2

Formal tendering process – no in house bid

Advantages

- Stable contract price
- Operational & financial risk transferred to contractor
- Staff management – contractor issue

Disadvantages

- Lack of flexibility
- Staff morale low during tendering process
- Profit element built into contract price
- Profit – primary driver for external market
- Contract start up delivery failings
- Corporate Priorities may not be key focus
- Expensive tendering process

Option 3

Formal tendering process – with an in house bid

Advantages

- Stable contract price
- More robust contract management structure established

Disadvantages

- Staff morale low during tendering process
- If externally won – please see option 2
- If internally won – please see option 1

59. It should be noted that any formal tendering process will need to be undertaken in accordance with EU procurement regulations and will take approximately 9-12 months. The cost of any tendering process would be dependant on the scope of the contract and would cost over £250,000. At present there is no funding allocated for a procurement process if members wish to tender the service during 2004/05. In addition, if the in house bid is not selected there may also be redundancies that have to be funded by the clients.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

60. Basic environmental cleanliness is a universal service that affects all residents of the Borough. The improvements to date along with the planned improvements for the future should enhance the quality of life for all.

61. Further, the ethnic make up of staff with Southwark Cleaning closely matches that of the community it serves.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER OFFICERS

The Borough Solicitor and Secretary

62. The Council has an obligation to deliver Best Value in the way in which it provides its services, in that it must secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness (s 3 Local Government Act 1999). The report sets out the ways in which officers recommend that these outcomes are best met, which in this case is by continued provision by the in-house provider. Having said that, there is an assumption in government guidance that there will be at least a consideration of external competition for a service.

63. Officers and members will wish to consider in the future whether the in-house service continues to offer best value over the rest of the proposed period. In the short term, this is particularly the case given the reduction in the 'front loading' with effect from August 2003 – paragraph 36 of the report - and the consequent uncertainty about the effect that this will have on satisfaction measures. There is further, as the report points out, a long lead-time between a decision to outsource the service and the commencement of a contract. The report sets out the measures that have been put in place to manage the relationship with the in-house service – paragraphs 30-33. Officers and members may wish to consider whether it would be appropriate to have annual reporting to the Executive on the
64. Officers will need to consider the provisions of the Common and Leasehold Reform Act 2002 on the provision of this service by this means. This Act gives requirements which must be fulfilled if the Council is to be in a position to recover recharges from those leaseholders who have purchased under the Right to Buy legislation. It is recommended that the proposal and the documentation, which it is proposed to put in place, should be reviewed in order to avoid or minimise any financial loss, which might be occasioned by the placing of an in-house arrangement in respect of estate cleaning and some ground maintenance.
65. It is for members to consider whether to accept the recommendation made having taken into account all matters in this report.

Chief Finance Officer

66. This report asks members to note the performance of the Integrated Cleaning Contract and Southwark Cleaning. It also asks members to review the options for future delivery arrangements, these being;
- Continued in house provision with regular review mechanisms
 - Formal tendering – no in house bid
 - Formal tendering – with an in house bid.
67. The full year costs for 2003/04 are expected to be some £17.5m, this exceeds the original budget by £2.2m, this additional expenditure was due to variations to the original specification.
68. The General Fund element of this expenditure (£1.1m) was identified during the 2003/04 budget setting process and was fully funded through growth bids and is now part of the base budget for the service. The HRA element (£1.1m) was not budgeted for and was funded from existing HRA resources.
69. Provision has been made in Housing Revenue Account (£11m) and General Fund budgets (£6.9m) for £17.9m in 2004/05. The Directors of Environment & Leisure and Housing have given assurances that all aspects of the current service described in this report are contained within 2004/05 budgets.
70. Both options to tender will cause additional costs for retendering to be incurred; this cost has been estimated as being in excess of £250,000, currently no budget provision exists. There is the risk of redundancy costs if the service is externalised. These costs have not been quantified in this report, and as with the cost of retendering, no current budget provision exists for them.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Performance database APSE Performance Report	Waste Division, Manor Place Depot	Mary Morrissey 020 7525 2484

Audit Trail

Lead Officer	Gill Davies and Keith Broxup	
Report Author	Phil Davies	
Version	Final	
Dated	14 June 2004	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	Yes	Yes
Chief Finance Officer	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Housing	Yes	Yes
<i>List other Officers here</i>		
Executive Member		
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services	14 June 2004	

Service Standards

The Integrated Cleaning Contract (ICC) is designed to deliver consistently high standards across the borough. Specifically:

• **Street Cleaning**

Southwark's roads are split into four categories dependant on how much they are used by people.

Zone One Plus	Swept constantly throughout the day
Zone One	Swept every day of the week
Zone Two	Swept Monday, Wednesday and Friday
Zone Three	Swept Tuesday and Thursday
Fly tips	Removed constantly

• **Estate Cleaning**

General Areas	Swept daily
Stairs	Swept daily and washed twice per week
Lifts	Swept and washed daily
Balconies	Swept daily and washed twice per week
Bin Chambers	Swept daily and washed weekly
Fly tips	Removed constantly

• **Ground Maintenance**

Grass Cutting	Fortnightly
Shrub beds	Maintained monthly
Litter Picking	Daily
Seasonal Works	As appropriate dependant on species

Response Times

A range of response times are set out in the ICC. Some examples follow:

Fly Tips	Removed within 24 hours of report receipt
Graffiti (Racist/Obscene)	Removed within four working hours
Graffiti (Standard)	Removed within 24 hours of report receipt

