

EXETER CITY COUNCIL

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 JANUARY 2008

EXECUTIVE

22 JANUARY 2008

PROVISION AND MANAGEMENT OF DOG WASTE BINS

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To report the key findings of a Member working group in relation to improving the provision of dog waste bins within the City, and reducing the contamination of land by dogs.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 5 June 2007 Scrutiny Committee Community agreed to the formation of a working group to review the provision of dog waste bins in the City and other factors affecting contamination of land by dogs. The findings of the group was to be reported back to the Scrutiny Committee. The membership of the working group is given in Appendix I.
- 2.2 The working group considered the following key issues:
- examining existing provision and identifying changes in bin capacity and collection rate to better meet need;
 - determining a methodology for prioritising provision of bins in new locations in response to any requests;
 - identifying changes to improve the use of bins;
 - the provision of bins on private land;
 - the role of education and enforcement.

3. KEY OUTCOMES OF WORKING GROUP

- 3.1 The Council currently has 132 dog bins in the City predominantly placed in areas where people regularly exercise their dogs. Since July 2007, the volume of waste in each bin has been monitored by the collectors to inform the modelling of collection frequencies and bin capacity. As a result, the group identified changes to collection frequencies and sites requiring greater capacity (by provision of back-to-back bins) that should ensure that bins are not over-filled. It also identified that there was little or no scope to transfer existing bins from areas of lower demand to new locations identified.
- 3.2 A methodology for assessing requests for the provision of new bins in a locality was determined and agreed (Appendix II). This assessment will enable requests to be objectively determined and prioritised, and alternative strategies to providing a bin identified (e.g. enforcement and/or education).

- 3.3 Using the methodology the group identified 7 locations where the provision of bins were a priority, and 20 locations where alternative strategies should be employed (Appendix III).
- 3.4 In relation to requests for bins to be provided and serviced on private land, the group determined that due to potential legal liabilities and cost implications of providing bins, other strategies would be employed to assist with any dog fouling problems.
- 3.5 The group agreed that the present bin design was fit for purpose and that identification numbers and contact details should be introduced to aid reporting of problems and monitoring. In addition, a bin-cleaning regime should be established.
- 3.6 It was recognised that bin provision alone would not solve the issue of dog fouling and that both enforcement and education were vital and necessary tools to use in conjunction with bins.

4 PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The provision of additional bins for the 7 sites identified can be met within existing resources. However, the 7 locations identified as priority sites for a bin cannot be serviced by the existing collection service, which is currently at full capacity (emptying around 400 bins per week). In order to meet the need at these priority sites and any future need within the City, it will be necessary to provide an additional collection vehicle and personnel. However, the cost of this provision may be partially off-set by also using it to supplement the garden waste collection service (to meet increased demand from residents) on alternate days and weekends.
- 4.2 The proposed bin-cleaning regime will be carried out by this additional vehicle and personnel.
- 4.3 The methodology used for determining the priority of provision will be used by officers assessing all requests for dog bins from whatever source (officers, Members, organisations and the public).
- 4.4 Other recommendations of the working group (Appendix IV) will be carried out within existing resources.

5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The capital cost of a collection vehicle is estimated at £30,000, with a revenue cost of £25,000 per annum for a Driver/Collector and running costs.

6 RECOMMENDED

That Scrutiny Committee – Community supports and Executive approves:

- (1) the purchase of a dual purpose collection vehicle at a capital cost of £30,000 in 2008-2009, and the employment of 1 full time equivalent Collector/Driver from 1 April 2008, at an annual revenue cost of £25,000, which includes running costs;

- (2) the adoption of the methodology for prioritising dog bin provision in response to requests detailed in Appendix II of this report; and
- (3) the completion of the remaining recommendations of the working group detailed in Appendix IV of this report by June 2008.

HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

S:LP/Committee/108SCC1
3.1.08

COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1972 (as amended)
Background papers used in compiling this report:-

DOG BIN PROVISION WORKING GROUP: MEMBERSHIP

- Cllr. M. Baldwin [Chair]
- Cllr. C. Boyle
- Cllr. M. Choules
- Cllr. M. Danks
- Cllr. L. Newton
- Cllr. L. Robson
- Robert Norley (Head of Environmental Health Services)
- Mike Trim (Cleansing Manager)
- Louise Harvey (Operations Manager, Cleansing)
- Leslie Rapley (Performance Project Officer)
- Wendy Johnson, (Environmental Protection Assistant)
- Paul Faulkner, (Parks & Open Spaces Manager)

APPENDIX II

CRITERIA FOR THE ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISATION OF DOG BIN PROVISION IN A PARTICULAR AREA

Part 1: assessment and scoring

Criterion	High	Medium	Low
Scarcity of provision	4	2	1
Contamination assessment	4	2	1
Activity – complaints, enforcement, cleansing	4	2	1
Impact on all users	4	2	1
Ease of collection	4	2	1
Totals			
Aggregate score			

- An aggregate score of 16-20 would indicate high priority, and active consideration for provision of dog bins.
- An aggregate score of 11-15 would indicate medium priority, and active consideration of other resolutions.
- An aggregate score of 5-10 would indicate low priority, and no further action besides keeping the area under review.

Part 2: determination of appropriate solution

Following this scoring, a second stage assessment must take place to establish whether the provision of a bin would substantially help resolve the problem. If so, then a bin should be provided, and if not then alternative resolutions should be pursued, e.g. enforcement and education. Due to the difficulties involved with private land, the provision of a bin will be discounted.

RESULTS FOR ASSESSMENT OF AREAS IDENTIFIED

APPENDIX III

Location	Scarcity of provision	Contamination Assessment	Activity - Complaints / Enforcement	Impact on all users	Ease of collection	Total score	Priority
Ibstock	4	1	1	2	4	12	Medium
Hereford Road at the walk way to Lichfield Road (heavy deposits in hedge)	4	4	4	4	4	20	High
Guinness Lane	4	1	2	2	4	13	Medium
Farm Hill – central	4	1	1	2	4	12	Medium
Exwick area to the Quay	1	1	2	1	1	6	Low
Addison Close – walkway to cemetery	1	1	1	1	1	5	Low
Antoine Crescent at entrance to nature reserve	2	2	1	1	1	7	Low
Quarry Lane between Southam Fields and Kings Heath	4	2	2	3	4	15	Medium
Coberg Green	4	2	2	3	4	15	Medium
Plantagenet Drive or Brockey Walk	4	2	2	3	4	15	Medium
Old Pavillion Place - Green Area	3	1	1	3	4	12	Medium
Widgery Rd / Bennett Sq green play area	4	3	3	4	4	18	High
Glasshouse Lane	1	1	1	1	2	6	Low
Sheridan Rd green area	4	3	3	2	4	16	High
Summerway large green area	4	3	2	3	4	16	High
Thackeray Rd	4	1	1	1	4	11	Medium
Ashleigh Alphington	4	4	3	4	4	19	High
Gras Lawn	4	2	1	2	4	13	Medium
Royal Close Green Alphington	4	3	3	4	4	18	High
Vicarage Rd / Garden area	1	1	1	1	4	8	Low
Exwick Hill - by school	1	1	1	1	4	8	Low
Gloucester Rd - green area by Guildford Close	3	2	1	2	4	12	Medium
Alphinbrook Rd - by stile	4	3	3	1	3	14	Medium
Savoy Hill / Lancelot Rd - Connecting path	4	2	1	2	3	12	Medium
Vaughan Rd - Green area	4	3	3	3	4	17	High
Pinwood Meadow	3	1	1	2	4	11	Medium

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM DOG BIN PROVISION WORKING GROUP

The working group made the following recommendations on 15 November 2007.

Environmental Health Services to:

- 1) Continue the monitoring of dog waste volumes in bins and model collection frequencies and bin capacity accordingly and in line with seasonal fluctuations and use;
- 2) Adopt the methodology for prioritising provision of bins in new locations henceforth;
- 3) Subject to funding being approved, make suitable provision for bins at the priority sites identified and for future sites identified;
- 4) Facilitate marking of bins to aid identification, monitoring and reporting of faults;
- 5) Implement a suitable bin-cleaning regime to engender use of bins by dog owners;
- 6) Promote information about the correct disposal of dog waste;
- 7) Increase publicity about enforcement action, including the issuing of fixed penalty notices and prosecutions;
- 8) Explore the merits of promoting dog waste disposal units to householders.

The working group also wished to record it's thanks to Wendy Johnson and other staff within Environmental Health Services for their good work in enforcing against dog fouling and promoting responsible dog ownership.