



Email: committeeservices@horsham.gov.uk
Direct line: 01403 215465

Cabinet

Thursday, 24th November, 2016 at 5.30 pm
Conference Room, Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham

Councillors:	Ray Dawe	Leader
	Jonathan Chowen	Deputy Leader and Leisure and Culture
	Philip Circus	Housing and Public Protection
	Roy Cornell	Waste, Recycling and Cleansing
	Brian Donnelly	Finance and Assets
	Gordon Lindsay	Local Economy
	Kate Rowbottom	Community and Wellbeing
	Claire Vickers	Planning and Development

You are summoned to the meeting to transact the following business

Tom Crowley
Chief Executive

Agenda

	Page No.
1. Apologies for absence	
2. Minutes	3 - 10
To approve as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 22 nd September 2016	
3. Declarations of Members' Interests	
To receive any declarations of interest from Members of the Cabinet	
4. Announcements	
To receive any announcements from the Leader, Cabinet Members or the Chief Executive	
5. Public Questions	
To receive questions from and provide answers to the public in relation to matters which in the opinion of the person presiding at the meeting are relevant to the business of the meeting	
6. Medium Term Financial Strategy	11 - 20
Report of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets on the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 to 2019/20	
7. Waste and Recycling Collection Review	21 - 148

Report of the Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing on proposed changes to Household Waste Collections

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|
| 8. | Green Waste Charge | 149 - 156 |
| | Report of the Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing on the charge for the collection of Green Waste | |
| 9. | Rural Car Parking | 157 - 176 |
| | Report of the Cabinet Member for Local Economy on rural car parking arrangements | |
| 10. | Overview & Scrutiny Committee | |
| | Recommendations have been received from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee regarding the Section 106 agreement process and officers are currently working with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development, who will respond to the Committee. | |
| 11. | Forward Plan | 177 - 184 |
| | To note the Forward Plan | |
| 12. | To consider matters of special urgency | |

Cabinet
22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Present: Councillors: Ray Dawe (Leader), Jonathan Chowen (Deputy Leader), Philip Circus (Housing & Public Protection), Roy Cornell (Waste, Recycling & Cleansing), Brian Donnelly (Finance & Assets), Gordon Lindsay (Local Economy), Kate Rowbottom (Community & Wellbeing) and Claire Vickers (Planning & Development)

Also Present: Councillors: Leonard Crosbie, Nigel Jupp and Christian Mitchell

EX/32 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18th August 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader.

EX/33 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

EX/34 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Cabinet Member for Local Economy reported on the success of the Jobs and Skills Fair, which had been held at the Drill Hall in Horsham on 14th September 2016.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Development thanked the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture and the Director for Community Services for the public meeting they had held in Southwater regarding the issues that had arisen in the area as result of the success of the new Dinosaur Island at Southwater Country Park.

The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture advised Members that an exhibition of English watercolours at Horsham Museum would open to the public on 24th September and run until 15th October 2016.

EX/35 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No questions had been received.

EX/36 **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Development reported that the Council had invited representations on its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule from 6 May to 17 June 2016, in line with the requirements of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). The relevant evidence supporting the

Draft Charging Schedule was published alongside and comments were invited. A total of 24 people or organisations responded.

A developer had requested that another strategic site in the District (Kilwood Vale) should have a zero CIL charge as they were concerned that there was no flexibility in the CIL Draft Charging Schedule or the current regulations that would allow them to amend their applications, if needed in the future, to effectively deliver the site. Whilst this issue could be resolved, it required more than a minor change to the Draft Charging Schedule, although the rate and the amount of money that would be generated would remain unchanged as the infrastructure would be delivered through Section 106 agreements as currently planned.

Additional evidence had been produced to support and test the viability of this proposal. If the proposal was approved by Cabinet, this evidence, as well as the detailed wording of the change to the document, would be subject to targeted public consultation before submission of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule, Proposed Modifications (and any comments on the Proposed Modifications) for examination by an independent Examiner. The Examination could then take place directly following the consultation on the Proposed Modifications.

As the Proposed Modifications aimed to address this main issue in addition to minor issues raised during the preparation of the Draft Charging Schedule, the Council would have done all it could to minimise the length of the examination and ensure the adoption of its CIL charge in a timely way.

The Planning and Development Policy Development Advisory Group supported the proposal.

RESOLVED

- (i) That an additional strategic site (Kilwood Vale) should be zero rated for CIL.
- (ii) That the Proposed Modification in recommendation (i) be subject to four weeks' consultation, prior to submission for Examination.
- (iii) That the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development be authorised to agree minor editorial changes.

REASONS

- (i) To take into account issues raised during the consultation period that would address concerns about the deliverability of a key allocation within the HDPF and lead to the Examiner finding CIL appropriate for adoption by the Council.
- (ii) To ensure that the Examiner has clarity on any outstanding issues prior to his examination. Note that the 4 week consultation period

on proposed modifications is a requirement of the CIL Regulations.

- (iii) To undertake minor editorial or typographical amendments.

EX/37 **STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT 2016**

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Development reported that the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was a statutory document which set out the ways in which the Council would engage with residents, communities, businesses, local organisations and other groups to ensure as many people as possible were able to have a say in planning decisions that affected them.

The document provided guidance on how the planning system worked and advised the manner in which the Council would inform, consult and involve people in planning decisions within the District, excluding the area within the South Downs National Park.

The current SCI had been reviewed in 2013. In response to changes in the planning system and feedback from consultation bodies an updated and revised SCI was now required and a draft Statement of Community Involvement had therefore been prepared for public consultation.

The Planning and Development Policy Development Advisory Group supported the proposal.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the draft Statement of Community Involvement, as submitted, be approved for a 6 week period of public consultation.
- (ii) That the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development be authorised to agree minor editorial changes prior to publication.

REASONS

- (i) To enable the draft SCI, which satisfies current legislation, to go forward for consultation.
- (ii) To undertake minor editorial or typographical amendments.

EX/38 **PRIVATE SECTOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Public Protection reported that the Council's Private Sector Housing Assistance Policy had first been adopted in July 2003 as a result of the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002.

The Regulatory Reform Order required Local Authorities to adopt and publish a Policy in respect of housing renewal should they wish to continue to give private sector housing assistance. It gave Local Authorities the power to grant discretionary housing assistance in any form.

Approval was now sought to increase the amount of assistance that could be offered to help a disabled person move to a more suitable property and to make available discretionary Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) as a 'top up' to mandatory DFGs, subject to available resources.

The Housing and Public Protection Policy Development Advisory Group supported the proposal

RESOLVED

- (i) That the amount of Moving Home Assistance be increased to £10,000 and that the repayment conditions be aligned with those for mandatory DFGs as set out in the report.
- (ii) That discretionary Disabled Facilities Grants be made available normally to a maximum amount of £10,000 as a 'top up' to mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants and that the repayment conditions be aligned with those for mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants as set out in the report.

REASONS

- (i) To enable the Council to sustain a robust Private Sector Housing Assistance Policy.
- (ii) To effectively use the increase in funding the Department of Health is providing to local authorities for home adaptations.

EX/39 **CONSTRUCTION OF NEW MULTI-USE GAMES AREA PITCHES AT BROADBRIDGE HEATH LEISURE CENTRE**

The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture reminded Cabinet that, on 23rd November 2015, they had approved the redevelopment of the leisure centre at Broadbridge Heath and Council had approved the budget for the project on 9th December 2015.

The first phase of the project was to relocate the Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) pitches onto land to the south of the Bowls Club, which was to be transferred to the Council by Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd (Countryside) in accordance with an obligation in the section 106 agreement for Countryside's housing development at Broadbridge Heath.

The Council's appointed professional team for the Broadbridge Heath leisure centre project had advised that the most suitable form of contract for this project

would be a single stage design and build contract, where contractors were provided with a robust set of employer's requirements, which were competitively tendered. The contractors then determined the most appropriate design and construction methodology that would satisfy the employer's requirements.

The procurement of the contract had been through an open local tender process, with tenderers being invited to submit two proposals, Option A and Option B. Option A was for the construction of three MUGA pitches and Option B was for the construction of three pitches, with an option for a further two shortly thereafter. The option choice would depend on whether the Council agreed terms to construct two MUGA pitches on behalf of Countryside under a proposed variation to the s106 agreement.

Following a cost and quality evaluation of the tenders received, it was recommended that Company A should be selected as contractors for the project.

The Cabinet Member reported that his Policy and Development Advisory Group had considered this at their meeting on 15th September and supported the proposal.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the tender received from Company A be approved and that they be awarded the contract.
- (ii) That the Director of Community Services be authorised to enter into the contract for the appointment of Company A for either Option A or Option B, as outlined in the report, dependent on the finalisation of terms with Countryside.

REASON

To appoint a contractor to undertake the construction of Multi Use Games Area pitches at Broadbridge Heath.

EX/40 **COMMERCIAL WASTE DISPOSAL**

The Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing reported that the Council currently disposed of commercial (trade) waste collected from businesses across the District. The waste collected was transported to Burgess Hill Transfer Station which was operated by Viridor Waste Ltd on behalf of West Sussex County Council.

The disposal costs currently incurred by the Council impacted on the commercial competitiveness of the service. The Council was not legally bound by any agreement with the County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority. However, a reasonable period of notice was required to withdraw or amend

current arrangements with the County Council and intention of such was made in November 2015.

Soft market testing had been undertaken which had concluded that a tendering exercise was required to secure a disposal tariff set against a range of waste and recycling materials, with preferred options available for selection based on a best price basis. In addition to this the tender included the need for each supplier to consider any logistical benefits linked to transfer site locations which would offer reduced carbon footprint and minimise transport costs.

The tenders received had now been evaluated and it was recommended that the contract should be awarded to Company A.

The Waste, Recycling and Cleansing Policy Development Advisory Group supported the proposal.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the tender submitted by Company A be accepted and that they be awarded the contract.
- (ii) That the Director of Community Services be authorised to approve any minor contractual changes during the contract term.

REASON

The contract for disposal of commercial waste was offered to a number of suppliers. This exercise elicited only one bid. The bid submitted will deliver a significant saving to the Council compared to existing disposal arrangements with West Sussex County Council.

EX/41 **PURCHASE OF WHEELED BINS**

The Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing reported that the Council required plastic wheeled bins for the collection of domestic refuse, recycling and garden waste.

The current contract for the supply of wheeled bins had expired and therefore it had been necessary to undertake a tendering exercise to obtain wheeled bins at the most competitive price, balanced against quality and the ability to supply.

A tender exercise had been conducted through a framework agreement managed by Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation and the submissions had been evaluated. Key considerations of the tender exercise included unit costs, phased supply to assist with optimum storage requirements and the ability to supply in a timely manner to meet local demand.

Following the evaluation of the tenders it was recommended that the contract should be awarded to Company A.

The Waste, Recycling and Cleansing Policy Development Advisory Group supported the proposal.

RESOLVED

That the bid submitted by Company A be accepted and that they be awarded the contract as the preferred supplier of plastic wheeled bins for the next 4 years.

REASON

The tendering exercise offered a preferential unit cost for each bin, with the option of purchasing replacement parts as required.

EX/42 **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

There were no matters currently outstanding for consideration.

EX/43 **FORWARD PLAN**

The Forward Plan was noted.

EX/44 **TO CONSIDER MATTERS OF SPECIAL URGENCY**

There were no matters of special urgency to be considered.

The meeting closed at 6.12 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to Cabinet

24 November 2016

By Brian Donnelly (Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets)

DECISION REQUIRED



**Horsham
District
Council**

Not Exempt

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 to 2019/20

Executive Summary

The review of the Financial Strategy, as part of the budget setting process, enables a balanced budget target to be established with a focus on an affordable level of Council Tax, delivery of the corporate priorities and policies of the Council and the continued enhancement of value for money and satisfaction with services for the residents of the District.

The 2016/17 budget was set in February 2016 and future deficits were projected for 2017/18 through to 2019/20. Since then there has been a period of planning on a range of income generation ideas, continuing the business transformation journey to the next stage and other efficiency measures. This report sets out the proposed Strategy for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20 to establish the context for the Council's budget and medium term financial planning scenarios and assumptions.

Recommendations

That the Cabinet recommends Council:

- i) note the projected budget gap detailed in paragraph 3.6
- ii) approve the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 to 2019/20.

Background papers

Report to Cabinet

Wards affected: all

Contact: Jane Eaton, Director of Corporate Resources, extension 5300
Dominic Bradley, Head of Finance, extension 5302

Background Information

1 Introduction and background

- 1.1 The Medium Term Financial Strategy was last fully reviewed by Council on 24 February 2016 as part of the annual budget setting cycle. At that meeting a balanced budget for 2016/17 was set. Cabinet and Members have received a number of presentations since then to keep them informed of progress with the development of the new strategy.
- 1.2 The local government finance system is becoming increasingly complex. The difficulty of predicting what factors such as interest rates, Grant funding and energy costs will be in two to five years' time is further complicated by uncertainty regarding the financial impact of the government's welfare reform programme and future income from retained Business Rates. It is however certain that the amount of money available to district councils will continue to reduce over the next five years.
- 1.3 During 2016, officers have been working up plans to address the budget deficits that were projected for 2017/18 through to 2019/20. This has been done through a combination of a range of measures including income generation, continuing the business transformation journey to meet the demands and expectations of our customers, and other efficiency measures. Each year as the budget is set, unavoidable growth becomes apparent in the services. This is because of increased responsibilities from legislation, contractual obligations and inflationary pressures.
- 1.4 This review ensures that the 2017/18 budget and resultant Council Tax level will be set within the context of the Council's Corporate Plan priorities and the financial strategy in order to deliver a balanced budget, updated for the latest information and knowledge available to the Council.

2 Relevant Council policy

- 2.1 To deliver a balanced budget over the medium term.

3 Details

Strategic political, economic and regulatory outlook

- 3.1 The offer made by Government last year offer of a four-year settlement through to 2019/20 has been agreed. This provides a relative degree of certainty in that the Revenue Support Grant and the baseline Business Rates funding level won't get any worse during this period. However this does mean a £800,000 reduction in our government funding, which is 29% of the total.
- 3.2 The Local Government Association (LGA) has calculated that the total Core Spending Power of all Local Authorities (defined as baseline funding from government in paragraph 3.1 and income from Council Tax and Business Rates retention) will reduce by £6.75bn over the review period (2015/16-2019/20). More details of how this will filter through are likely to emerge in the Autumn Statement Spending Review scheduled on 23 November 2016. The Council's detailed financial settlement for 2017/18 will probably be communicated to us immediately prior to Christmas.

- 3.3 On 23rd June 2016, the EU referendum took place and the people of the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union. Until exit negotiations are concluded, the UK remains a full member of the European Union and all the rights and obligations of EU membership remain in force. During this period the government will continue to negotiate, implement and apply EU legislation. It will be for the government to begin negotiations to exit the EU and the outcome of these negotiations will determine what arrangements apply in relation to EU legislation and funding in future, once the UK has left the EU.
- 3.4 The UK economic outlook has been affected by the vote to leave the EU in the short term. Whilst the long term future impact remains uncertain it should be noted that interest rate forecasts have been updated based upon outcomes to date, including the reduction of the Bank of England base rate, the widening of the quantitative easing programme which saw additional bond releases and the reduction in the credit rating of UK banks by investment firms. Interest rates are at historically low levels with significant increases now not predicted within the period of this MTFS. The value of the pound has also decreased significantly; by 20% against the U.S. Dollar and by 15% against the Euro. Conversely, the FTSE 100 share index has risen by around 10% since the referendum to approach 7,000. Inflation has started to increase in recent months putting pressure on expenditure, measured in September 2016 at 1% under the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and 2% under the Retail Price Index (RPI). The impact from the cost of fuel is also slowly rising.
- 3.5 Both the demand for the Council's services and its income streams are affected by the general economic health of the District, and the prevailing interest rate has a direct impact on interest receipts. Therefore the uncertainty of the economic and regulatory outlook adds risk to the setting of a precise financial strategy. With this in mind, the assumptions within the MTFS have been revisited in the sections below.

Budget assumptions prior to remedial action

- 3.6 Future budget projections are based on a number of assumptions. Table 1 sets out the budget assumptions at November 2016 and Table 2 the forecast revenue budgets in 2017/18 through to 2019/20. Details of the budget assumptions and the reasons for the change in assumptions are explained in the following paragraphs.

Table 1: Budget assumptions

Budget Assumptions	November 2016		
	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
Pay award annual 1%	£175k	£175k	£175k
Inflationary pressures approx. 1.75% to 2.5%	£250k	£300k	£300k
Pensions revaluation approx. 1%	£125k	£125k	£150k
Minimum level of reserves	£6m	£6m	£6m
Reduction in RSG	£680k	£280k	£700k
Increase in dwellings	1,000	1,000	1,000
Increase in Council Tax*	0%	0%	0%

*Central government's assumption of a Council Tax increase by a district council is £5.

Table 2: Revenue budget prior to remedial action

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
November 2016	£000	£000	£000
Net expenditure	13,378	13,884	14,777
Funded by: New Homes Bonus	800	500	200
Council Tax	8,376	8,504	8,631
Government grant - RSG	149	0	0
Government grant - transitional	134	0	0
Government grant - negative RSG	0	0	(695)
Government grant - Business Rates	1,915	1,972	2,034
Additional Business Rates retained	400	400	400
Payment to parishes	(10)	(0)	(0)
Total funding	11,764	11,376	10,570
Net deficit	1,614	2,508	4,207

Inflation cost pressures and interest rates

- 3.7 Local Government pay is negotiated nationally and the Council has no direct influence on the settlement. The local government pay award of 1% in May 2016 covered both 2016/17 and 2017/18. Given the potential prospect that inflationary pressures may drive further salary demands, a further 1% pay increase in 2018/19 and 2019/20 has been budgeted as well. In expenditure terms, this equates to approximately £175k of additional expenditure per annum.
- 3.8 Economic forecasters are predicting a diverse range on inflation over the next three years, reflecting the uncertainty of the post-Brexit era. The MTFs currently budgets for a 1.75% increase in inflation on the expectation that CPI will remain above the current 1% as a minimum, up to 2.5% by 2019/20. The Bank of England suggested in its November inflationary forecast this could be as much as 2.7% in 2017 and 2018. Whilst income is also affected by inflation, inflation also increases our expenditure that offsets the increases in Council Tax and charges. The impact of inflation on the MTFs will be revisited on a monthly basis as the monthly statistics are released by the Office of National Statistics. Likewise, the pension contributions of 1% will be revisited as information about the 2016 triennial revaluation of the Council's Pension Fund funding statement is finalised by the actuary.
- 3.9 The Bank of England base rate has recently fallen to a historic low of 0.25%, affecting the Council's income streams from investments. The Council has taken action over the past year to diversify the investment strategy into non-bank deposit holdings which should help to mitigate the effect, but nevertheless, this will impact on the Council's ability to generate income from investments during the period. Economic forecasters are again divided on when an upturn in interest rates may occur. The MTFs includes only a small increase over the three year period.

Council Tax

- 3.10 The government's 2015 Settlement funding assumptions assumed that all district councils would increase their Council Tax by £5 each year over the 4 year settlement period. The Council increased Council Tax by an inflationary 1.2% in

2016/17 which was the first increase since 2010/11. This raised an extra £100,000. It remains the lowest Council Tax in West Sussex and in the bottom quartile of all district councils.

- 3.11 For all other councils, central government assumed that Council Tax would rise by an inflationary forecast of 1.75% each year over the period. Using this inflationary measure as a proxy, a 1.75% p.a. increase in Council Tax raises approximately an additional £150,000 each year.

Localisation of Business Rates

- 3.12 From 1 April 2013 the structure of local government finance changed, with local authorities retaining a share of Business Rates collected in their area. The calculations are based on target rates of collection set by government and are somewhat complex, but resulted in the Council retaining around 5% of the £41m total collected, equating to around £2m. Local authorities can increase their business rate income by growing the business rate take in their area; conversely, if collections fall then local authorities bear an element of risk.
- 3.13 Historical data suggests a 'flat' picture with limited material Business Rates growth envisaged over the period of the MTFs, which is why the retained £400k additional business rate income remains static across the period. This area is a 'momentum indicator' where growth is more likely to continue where it is already taking place. At the moment, on average, every successful new business opening is offset by a conversion of a business premise to residential flats or a closure. In the first seven months of 2016/17, the rateable value declined by £620k. In the longer term, initiatives such as the development of North Horsham and the redevelopment of the old Novartis site may offer some upside but at the moment our economic growth as an area is way below the desirable level for affluence of its population.
- 3.14 In comparison with other authorities the Council is comparatively less at risk as it has relatively few single significant sites in respect of business rate valuations. For example, it is not the site of a power station, airport, major retail park or regional distribution centre. Some risk does exist however, principally around outstanding rates appeals for which the Council would have to bear its share of lost revenue should those appeals prove successful. The Council had a provision of £2m for business rate appeals at 31 March 2016. The slow rate at which the Valuation Office is tackling the backlog of appeals makes the Council sceptical that the provision for appeals will fall, especially as a very high level of appeals against the 2017 revaluation listing is expected.
- 3.15 Whilst the 2017 Valuation Office revaluation listing has increased the rateable value, the multiplier has fallen to compensate, with a planned neutral net effect across the country. A period of transition with a damping effect to limit some of the increases and decreases to businesses will come into effect from 2017/18. Based on early analysis, a relatively small increase in cost to the Council is expected as a result of these changes over the period of the MTFs.
- 3.16 The government has been consulting on the future of Business Rates with the intention of allowing local government to retain 100% of locally collected rates by the end of this parliament as announced in 2013. This does not mean that the Council will get to keep the £41m that it currently collects from Business Rates.

Business rate income will continue to be distributed around the country as before. The Council expects that any additional revenue will only replace reductions in RSG and New Homes Bonus which are known to and are expected to fall significantly, but this is also likely to come with additional responsibilities that will give rise to additional costs.

- 3.17 Furthermore, in the longer term, the March 2016 budget announced that the increase in the Business Rates multiplier will be switched from RPI to CPI from 2020. The multiplier is the annual increase in Business Rates determined by the government. CPI tends to go up more slowly than RPI so this change is likely to reduce the buoyancy in the Business Rates yield. Over time this will have a significant impact on the resources that are available to local government as a sector.
- 3.18 At this point therefore, it is difficult to calculate the effect of all these potential changes as not enough details are known but conclude that there is a high degree of uncertainty, especially beyond 2020. The Council will revisit the impact of this as it learns more of how the scheme will work and will feed this into a future MTFS.

New Homes Bonus (NHB)

- 3.19 The New Homes Bonus provides an incentive payment for local authorities to stimulate housing growth in their area. The calculation is based on Council Tax statistics submitted each October and, up to 2016/17, a 'bonus' was payable for the following six financial years based on each (net) additional property using a standardised Council Tax Band D amount (£1,455). In two-tier local government areas this payment is split in the ratio 20% to county councils, 80% to district councils. NHB is currently not ring-fenced and can be spent at the Council's discretion.
- 3.20 From 2017/18, the mechanism under which NHB funding levels are determined is due to change. A consultation has been undertaken by government. However the outcome of this has not yet been announced. What is known is that the number of years for which the bonus is payable is likely to reduce to less than 4 years and the amounts the Council will receive in future are likely to significantly reduce. We anticipate that the announcement on NHB will come through in the 2016 Autumn Statement.
- 3.21 In anticipation of this reduction in funding, the Council is planning to taper its revenue reliance on NHB over the three year period so that by 2020/21 it does not include any NHB in revenue funding. This contrasts to the £1.17m that was included in the 2015/16 revenue budget.
- 3.22 The NHB reserve stood at £3.7m at 31 March 2016. Once the future of New Homes Bonus becomes clearer, the Council could chose to develop a policy for spending part or fully the NHB for projects other than funding the existing capital programme. However, the resulting increase in financing costs will then need to be considered.

Capital programme

- 3.23 Planned capital expenditure of approximately £23m is expected in 2017/18, which reflects the building of the new Broadbridge Heath leisure centre, the redevelopment of the Hop Oast depot and the replacement of the current waste

collection vehicles which are reaching the end of their useful economic life. The impact of this large capital programme and the more modest future capital expenditure in 2018/19 and 2019/20 is that the Council's minimum revenue provision (a prudent mechanism to pay back the capital) increases significantly, as do the interest payments on the borrowing. By the end of the three year period, this equates to around an additional £1m of expenditure each year.

- 3.24 The provisional £23m 2017/18 programme includes around 20 capital programme bids for 2017/18 that have been put forward for consideration and the business cases are currently being reviewed. Around £3.8m of the £5.1m has identified funding sources, with the remaining £1.3m currently unfunded. The schemes include improvements to parks and countryside, parking and property. The two-stage challenge process will refine this list before the capital programme is presented and finalised in January 2017.

Reserves and reserve strategy

- 3.25 The Council holds two types of reserves, earmarked reserves and general revenue reserves. Earmarked reserves are funds received for a specific purpose. For example, grant funding that can only be expended on particular purposes. Details of the earmarked reserves held by the Council at 31st March 2016 are shown in table 4 below.

Table 4: Earmarked reserves

Earmarked Reserves at 31 March 2016	£'000
Neighbourhood Planning Grant	318
S106 reserves	1,393
NNDR reserve	1,435
Council Tax localisation	278
Health and Wellbeing	198
Weekly Waste Collection	254
Community reserves	250
Other	515

- 3.26 General reserves are reserves held to ensure that the Council has sufficient funds to deal with any emergency or uncertainty. The Council also uses its general fund reserves to fund capital expenditure and redundancy payments. General reserves at 31st March 2016 were £9.1m. Of this, £0.5m of the 2015/16 revenue budget surplus has subsequently been transferred into an earmarked transformation reserve to fund one-off up-front costs of business transformation.
- 3.27 The Council agreed in October 2012 on a minimum level of general reserves of £6m. From 2020 onwards income from central government is uncertain due to the consultation around business rate retention. The Council's current strategy on reserves gives sufficient flexibility and headroom to deal with any issues that arise. Implementing Future Horsham efficiencies and planned income schemes, together with the potential actions set out later below, would result in balanced budgets through to 31 March 2020. Apart from funding this transformation, the Council would not need to dip into reserves. Therefore the general fund balance is anticipated to be around the £7m mark at the end of 2019/20.
- 3.28 The intention is to further review the strategy in the light of any new information on business rate retention and political and regulatory announcements in the Autumn

Statement as and when these become available to ensure that the budgets will be balanced on an ongoing basis into the 2020s as well.

Future Horsham

- 3.29 For several months, under the banner of “Future Horsham”, the Council has been working on ideas to ensure that it can continue its business transformation journey to meet the demands and expectations of its customers in the face of financial and demographic pressures. Future Horsham will deliver a stronger Council which will be more productive and better equipped to serve customers. It will also help to protect front-line services whilst ensuring that the Council has a strong and responsive support services.
- 3.30 The key elements of the changes that are planned are:
- **Shared Services:** Following Cabinet approval in July 2016 to further investigate shared services, full business cases are being undertaken on Legal, HR and Internal Audit shared services with Chichester and Arun District Councils. Initial high level reviews indicated savings in the region of £250k p.a. could be made if these were fully implemented. In addition the Council are also looking at other areas of shared service, including for example expansion of the Building Control partnership to include Arun and Chichester District Councils.
 - **Change of technology:** The Council is working on a new ICT strategy which will help to define how it invests in technology to support the Future Horsham programme. For example, enhanced mobile working and a greater ability for customers to self-serve online. In addition the Council is in the process of procuring a new Financial Management System which will enable savings to be delivered.
 - **Self-service:** The future model for internal support services (e.g. Finance and HR) will mean that managers are trained, equipped and empowered to deal with routine matters directly so that costs are reduced in the back office.
 - **Service efficiency:** A systematic approach to redesigning business processes will be implemented to ensure they are as streamlined as possible and that the technology the Council employs works to maximum benefit.
 - **Contract reviews:** The Council will re-negotiate existing contracts with service suppliers to reduce costs. It has already done so to a substantial scale on the Leisure Centre Management contract.
 - **New businesses:** The Council aims to become more commercial. It needs to generate more income and have more ideas such as the recent bulky bag collection service.
 - **Benefits review:** Longer term, the Council is looking at how it can operate the Council Tax Benefits support scheme more efficiently and this has the potential to save money. Consultants have been appointed by Census to give initial option appraisals.
- 3.31 In total, Future Horsham business transformational efficiencies are expected to contribute around £1.4m towards the £4.2m budget gap by 2019/20. In addition, the Council has identified around £1.8m of new income sources and additional income expected from a growth in the number of users.

Potential actions

- 3.32 The Council has a number of potential actions it could take to mitigate the deficit. It could choose to increase Council Tax, fees and charges. It could also consider ceasing the delivery of some services and further rationalising its property estates.
- 3.33 When the budget report is presented to Cabinet at the end of January 2016, it will include the anticipated savings from the business transformation programme, commissioning opportunities and other service efficiencies.
- 3.34 Potential actions are summarised in table 5 below. The waste collection, rural car-parking options and increasing garden waste charges are included on the Cabinet agenda. The decisions on those items will have a significant bearing on the overall strategy and if approved there will be less pressure on discretionary front line services. In addition Cabinet is recommended to support the proposed increases in Council Tax and to recommend to Council that the MTFs is approved on that basis.

Table 5: Potential options

Potential Options	2017/18 £000s	2018/19 £000s	2019/20 £000s
Procurement of rear-loading waste collection vehicle fleet in 2018/19	0	270	270
Alternate weekly collection of waste in 2018/19	0	730	730
Increase in Garden waste charge £2 in 2017/18 and 2018/19.	105	210	210
Introduce Rural car-parking disk charges in 2017/18	0	315	315
Increase Council Tax by central government assumption of 1.75% inflation	150	300	450
Total of potential options	255	1,825	1,975

4 Next steps

- 4.1 On 26 January 2017, the 2017/18 budget will be taken to Cabinet to recommend approval at the 15 February 2017 full Council meeting where the Council Tax for 2017/18 will be set. The MTFs will also be updated at this time to take account of the Autumn Statement and our settlement plus the final details of the 2017/18 budget.

5 Views of the Policy Development Advisory Group and outcome of consultations

- 5.1 The proposed MTFs, assumptions and potential actions were considered by the Finance and Assets Policy Development and Advisory Group at its meeting on 25 October 2016 and the Group was supportive of the proposed strategy.
- 5.2 A seminar for all Members was held on 10 November 2016 to allow all Members the opportunity to discuss and review the MTFs proposals in advance of the 2017/18 budget setting process.
- 5.3 The Chief Executive, Directors and the Head of Finance have been extensively involved in preparing the medium term financial strategy and are fully supportive of its contents. The Monitoring Officer has also been consulted during the preparation of the document and is supportive of its contents.

6 Other courses of action considered but rejected

- 6.1 Not taking actions set out in this report would put at risk the ability of the Council to reduce the budget deficits that are projected for 2017/18 through to 2019/20. Therefore, not taking any action has been rejected.

7 Resource consequences

- 7.1 The Future Horsham changes will lead to a reduction in the size of the workforce over the next three years. In September 2016, Horsham District Council employed 483 staff in total. This constituted 413 full time equivalent (FTE) posts. The precise figure of reductions, currently estimated at 30 posts, will be firmed up as detailed plans for the individual elements are finalised.
- 7.2 In accordance with the Organisational Change Policy the Council will take steps to avoid compulsory redundancies as far as possible through a combination of vacancy control, redeployment and, in appropriate cases, voluntary redundancy. A small number of posts have already been deleted (these were agreed at the last Personnel Committee).

8 Legal consequences

- 8.1 There are no legal consequences as a result of this report.

9 Risk assessment

- 9.1 The Council's reliance on central government funding and balancing the medium term financial plan is captured on the Corporate risk register at CRR01. This is regularly reviewed and updated and is monitored at Accounts, Audit & Governance Committee on a quarterly basis.

10 Other Considerations

- 10.1 There are no consequences of any action proposed in respect of Crime & Disorder; Human Rights; Equality & Diversity and Sustainability.



Report to Cabinet

24th November 2016

By the Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and
Cleaving

DECISION REQUIRED

Not Exempt

Appendix 1 Exempt under paragraph 3 Part 1 of
Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act

Changes to Household Waste Collections

Executive Summary

The collection of household waste (residual waste and recycling) is one of the highest profile and highly valued services provided by the Council. Household waste is defined in Part II of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 as waste that originates from private homes and collected by Waste Collection Authorities (Horsham District Council). Legislation requires the Council to take action to increase the percentage of household waste that is recycled to at least 50% within three years, therefore reducing the proportion of waste disposed at landfill. We will not achieve this without implementing the recommendations as detailed in this report.

In addition to this, the Council is facing significant financial pressures with a need to find savings to address a £4.2m projected budget gap in 2019/20. This is combined with the loss of a specific government grant made to the Council to maintain the weekly collection of household refuse which expires in November 2017.

Horsham district currently has the highest recycling rate of any West Sussex authority and the Council has long taken a forward-looking approach to household waste collection. In 2008 the Council took what was then seen as an innovative move to purchase a fleet of side-loading waste collection vehicles. Alongside that, the Council also introduced the simple blue and brown lidded collection system for recycling that has been much praised by residents. Now that those vehicles are rapidly nearing the end of their useful life, becoming expensive to maintain and in need of replacement, the council must turn its attention to future requirements.

In response to this situation the Council commissioned Ricardo Energy & Environment Consultants to undertake a full review of the waste collection service. Their task was to assess the current provision and advise on the way forward suggesting how a high-quality service could be maintained and how financial efficiencies could be generated with a particular focus on increasing recycling rates. Ricardo worked with Members in a series of seminars to develop with them an agreed vision for the Waste & Recycling Service and recommended that the Alternate Weekly Collection of waste, similar to schemes operated successfully in Chichester and Mid Sussex District areas and in over 75% of other local authorities, was the recommended service model for our area.

The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval for the implementation of that vision based on the recommendations below.

Recommendations

That the Cabinet is recommended to:

- i) Agree to the introduction of Alternate Weekly Collections for residual household waste from Spring 2018, and note the estimated financial savings associated with this of approximately £730k per annum compared to the projected budget for 2018/19.
- ii) Agree that a rear-loading vehicle fleet is procured to deliver the revised service and note the estimated financial saving of approximately £270k per annum compared to the projected budget for 2018/19.
- iii) That Cabinet approves the changes to the council's waste policies required to implement the new service as detailed in section 3.16.
- iv) Agree to the draft implementation timetable (Table 3) subject to recommendations i) and ii) being agreed.
- v) Delegate authority to the Director of Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing to make necessary arrangements as required.

Reasons for Recommendations

- i) Legislation requires a reduction in the amount of waste currently going to landfill and an increase in recycling, 50% by 2020. The introduction of AWCs would following assessment from Ricardo encourage additional levels of recycling estimated at 4%; although other councils have observed up to a 9% increase in recycling rates and up to a 16% decrease in residual waste produced. Councils are required to deliver "good quality local services as efficiently as possible within their financial constraints".¹ The council must therefore set that requirement against action to mitigate a forecast funding gap of £4.2m in its medium term financial strategy (MTFS).
- ii) The current ageing waste collection vehicles require replacement.
- iii) Dispensations will ensure the implementation recognises households which will find AWC more challenging due to receptacle capacity.
- iv) Agreement to the approach and key milestones to implement both a revised collections methodology and procure a new fleet of refuse vehicles.

Background Papers

Exempt Ricardo report for Horsham District Council 'Strategic Review of Collection Services' October 2016.

Exempt Ricardo Appendix 1 & 2 Strategic Review of Collection Services' October 2016.

Waste Consulting – Waste analysis report (West Sussex waste partnership)

House of Commons Library Advice note 'Alternate weekly Collections' 4/2/2013

Waste Framework Directive, 2006, 2015

WRAP Statistics 2015/16

TEEP report Horsham District Council 29 January 2015 Cabinet

Recycling Payment Mechanism Memorandum of Understanding. – 28 January 2016 Cabinet

Wards affected: All wards

Contact: Natalie Brahma-Pearl, Director of Community Services

¹ Alternate weekly collections guidance, WRAP, 13 July 2007

Background Information

1 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 The recommendations in this report follow a strategic review of the waste collection service, and a detailed analysis of available options undertaken by Ricardo Consultants.
- 1.2 Rising national recycling targets of 50% by 2020 require the council to revise its current waste strategy.
- 1.3 In November 2012, the council was given a specific grant from the Government (Weekly Collection Support Scheme) which committed the council to providing a weekly residual household waste collections for a period of five years. Those grant conditions expire in November 2017 and will not apply after that date.
- 1.4 The council needs to make savings of approximately £4.2 million over the next three years due to significant cuts in government funding and increasing demand for services. The report on the Medium Term Financial Plan on this agenda also refers. The decision to change the frequency of residual household waste collections and changing the vehicle fleet will help to meet this shortfall with an estimated total saving of approximately £1m against the budget per annum. As with all other local authorities, this council is under considerable pressure to increase levels of recycling and minimise the volume of waste sent for disposal.
- 1.5 Legislation requires a reduction in the amount of waste going to landfill and an increase in recycling, in order to help address the economic and environmental impacts of waste. At the same time councils are required to deliver “good quality local services as efficiently as possible within their financial constraints”.² As a result, Alternate Weekly Collection (AWC) has been adopted by many councils, as it encourages recycling and can reduce the costs associated with waste collection and disposal. AWC does this as it restrains “the extent to which recyclable waste can be put into residual waste bins”, thereby releasing “money, manpower and equipment to provide high quality recycling services”.³

In 2007 a report produced by WRAP (Waste and Resources Action Programme) found that “well run” AWC schemes not only encourage recycling, but can also reduce the overall amount of waste produced by residents. It said that AWC:

- Raises awareness of the volumes of waste generated, prompting the segregation of materials for recycling and composting; and
- Prompts an overall reduction in residual waste arisings at the kerbside. The reduction is likely to be brought about by residents changing their habits regarding the amount of material they manage via other means (e.g. home composting) or by changing shopping habits to reduce e.g. food and packaging waste.⁴

- 1.6 In 2015/16 over 75% of local authorities⁵ in the UK have been operating a system whereby residents still receive a weekly household waste collection, but this is alternated between the collection of mixed dry recycling one week and residual household waste the following week. Ricardo has proposed that HDC adopts this system.
- 1.7 This alternate weekly collection (AWC) of residual (landfill) waste has been operating successfully in neighbouring district councils of Mid Sussex, Chichester and Mole Valley for a number of years.

² Alternate weekly collections guidance, WRAP, 13 July 2007

³ Alternate weekly collections guidance, WRAP, 13 July 2007

⁴ Alternate weekly collections guidance, WRAP, 13 July 2007

⁵ WRAP Statistics 2016

- 1.8 The change to AWC will encourage higher recycling rates and reduce the amount of waste sent to more expensive treatment facilities. It is well documented that AWC is a proven method for achieving increased levels of recycling with recycling rates increasing on average by 5-6%⁶. Recycling is increased by restricting the frequency and capacity of residual household waste collections. Currently we operate the service with 140-litre bins which would not require replacement unless households meet the Exceptions Policy criteria (see section 3.16). There is evidence that residents become more conscious of what is thrown away and what can be recycled⁷. Nearly all of the 20-top performing recycling Local Authorities operate AWCs. The Local Government Association has been particularly robust in offering this figure as evidence that AWC is essential to improved recycling.⁸ In order to further encourage recycling the council will provide an additional 140L blue lidded recycling bin for free (with a £5 delivery charge) for householders requiring more recycling capacity.
- 1.9 The top 10 performing recycling councils in 2014-15, in terms of household and recycling rates, all provided AWC. In addition, 9 out of 10 of the local authorities with the most improved recycling rates from 2010-2011 had introduced AWC⁹. 8 of 10 of the lowest performing councils have weekly domestic waste collections.
- 1.10 Waste composition analysis, carried out in December 2015 for the West Sussex Waste Partnership by Waste Consulting, showed that just under 20% of Horsham District's waste placed in residents' residual household waste bins could theoretically be recycled using existing recycling facilities (blue lidded bins).
- 1.11 **Vehicle Fleet- Side** loading refuse vehicles were introduced in Horsham in 2008/9 and were phased in over a year. These have been used to collect three household waste streams from residential properties (residual household waste, dry mixed recycling, and garden/green waste).
- 1.12 At the time this model was highlighted as the future in waste collection particularly in areas without Transfer Station access such as Horsham district. However, although used on the Continent, it never came into wide use in the UK, save a couple of authorities in Scotland and Bromsgrove which have since ceased using the system. As a consequence, purchasing/leasing similar new vehicles is now expensive compared with buying rear loading vehicles. This is compounded by high maintenance costs and limited access to specialist parts. In addition, very specific Heavy Goods Vehicle driver training is required to operate the system which often becomes challenging when covering holiday periods and absenteeism. Their roles are impossible to fill with Agency staff, often present operational challenges to service delivery.
- 1.13 Rear End Load Compaction (REL) vehicles are the conventional methodology for collecting household waste and they have been used since the 1960's. They offer a simple solution to collection and compaction of waste. A general comparison of side-loading vehicles and standard rear loading vehicles is provided in Appendix 2.
- 1.14 The benefits of these systems are clear; they are simple to operate and maintain; and offer greater control of operating and infrastructure costs with payload tonnages that are superior to the de-mountable side loader system currently in use. The cost per ton to collect and transport waste is cheaper to the tax payer.

⁶ Waste data flow (DCLG)

⁷ WRAP 2011 Literature Review -Relationship between food waste collection and food waste prevention

⁸ Local Government Association, press release, 26 April 2007

⁹ Battle of the bins: Defra stats show fortnightly refuse collections INCREASES recycling, The Independent, 31 December 2012

- 1.15 The savings by moving to RELs are estimated at £270k pa compared to the projected budget of 2018/19. Fewer vehicles are required due to increased tonnages RELs are able to accommodate. However, if side loading vehicles are chosen an additional £292k will be required on the 2018/19 projected budget as the cost to support this system – additional vehicles, tugs and pods has increased and we require more vehicles to carry out the service due to growth in housing since the scheme was launched in 2008/9.
- 1.16 The choice of a demountable side loading vehicle is understood to have been made in part due to the lack of transfer station within the District. At present, Horsham does not have a dedicated transfer station within its boundary. This is presently undergoing consideration by West Sussex County Council (WSSCC).
- 1.17. **Route optimisation-** In order to optimise operational efficiencies, collection rounds will need to be reviewed and re-modelled. This will result in reduced mileage, fuel savings, crew and fleet vehicle reduction. The current side-loader system requires refuse vehicles, tugs and de-mountable waste containers to be moved around and out of the district. REL's will stick to specific rounds and tip directly at Transfer sites. Some of these assumptions have been made in the Ricardo modelling work- however a specific in depth piece to work needs to be commissioned on route optimisation to ensure that the service operates as efficiently as possible. This will also take into account recent and future housing growth.

2 Relevant Council policy

- 2.1 The change to AWC will contribute to delivering the following corporate priorities:
Corporate plan priorities 2016-2019
Efficiency- great value services by transforming our waste collection service.
Environment - Review waste services to maximise the efficiency of the Service.
- Plan to reach 50% recycling of household waste by 2020.

3 Details

- 3.1 In June 2015, the Council commissioned Ricardo Energy & Environment Consultants following a procurement exercise to undertake a waste review. The purpose of which was to assess our current service and advise how efficiencies could be generated which focussed on increasing recycling rates. Ricardo's Consultants have been working with councillors in a series of workshops which all Members were invited to participate, over the last ten months. Members developed an agreed a vision for the Waste & Recycling Service and established what key issues are considered important in improving and taking the service forward.

Waste vision statement:

"Horsham District Council will deliver a cost-effective Recycling & Waste Service which is easy to use, protects the environment and achieves future recycling targets within budget".

- 3.2 The main principles and criteria identified by councillors were:

Principle 1: Ease of use
Principle 2: Improve recycling performance
Principle 3: Public satisfaction
Principle 4: Value for money
Principle 5: Good communication
Principle 6: Waste hierarchy

- 3.3 The Council is also required to meet the requirements of the European Commission's Waste Framework Directive as transposed by the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 in relation to recycling operations and material streams. If the Waste Regulations or other waste legislation is repealed following Brexit, the UK Government will

need to develop a similar waste policy in order to underpin any new legislation. This is explained in more detail in section 8 of this report.

- 3.4 Using the principles and criteria agreed with councillors, Ricardo Consultants developed a series of options which reflected how these criteria could be implemented. This resulted in a long list of 10 options (Table 1) which an all member seminar filtered to those more suitable options for Horsham district.

Table 1. Long Listed Options considered by Members.

Option		Vehicle Type	Recycling Collection Frequency	Residual Collection Frequency	Description
1	Business as Usual (BAU)	Side loading vehicles (SLVs)	Fortnightly	Weekly	Current service, fortnightly recycling collections and weekly residual using side loading vehicles
2	BAU + fortnightly residual collections	Side loading vehicles (SLVs)	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	BAU service but the residual collection is changed to a fortnightly service.
3	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Fortnightly	Weekly	This option retains the same collection frequencies as the BAU option but replaces the current demountable side loading vehicles with standard rear loading vehicles.
4	RLVs + Alternate Weekly Collections (AWC)	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Similar to Option 3 with standard RLVs. However, the residual waste is moved to fortnightly collections.
5	RLVs + dry recycling weekly	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Weekly	Weekly	Similar to Option 3 with standard RLVs, but the dry recycling moves from a fortnightly collection to weekly.
6	RLVs + dry recycling weekly & residual fortnightly	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Weekly	Fortnightly	Dry recycling moving from a fortnightly collection to weekly and residual moves to fortnightly.
7	Kerbside sort	Kerbside sort vehicles	Fortnightly	Weekly	Collection frequencies remain the same as present (residual weekly and dry fortnight) but the dry recycling moves to a kerbside sort system. Different containers will be provided to the householder (typically boxes) for the crew to then sort into separate compartments on a specialist kerbside sort vehicle.
8*	Kerbside sort + residual fortnightly	Kerbside sort vehicles	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	As Option 7, but residual waste moves to a fortnightly collection, reducing the resources required.
9	Kerbside sort + residual fortnightly & dry recycling weekly	Kerbside sort vehicles	Weekly	Fortnightly	Kerbside sort with dry recycling collected weekly and residual fortnightly.
10**	RLVs + Food waste & 3-weekly residual & dry recycling fortnightly	Kerbside sort vehicles	fortnightly	3 weekly including separate weekly food recycling	Kerbside sort with dry recycling collected fortnightly, food weekly and residual every three weeks.

*A kerbside sort option was included to assess feasibility under TEEP regulations.

**Food waste and 3-weekly collections were initially excluded from the long list. However, Horsham District Council still wishes to understand the implications of such an option and be prepared should any steer come from West Sussex County Council to introduce food collections. Therefore, a 3-weekly option with food waste will be taken forward to the detailed modelling phase in order to provide future insight.

3.5 Six shortlisted options were then subject to detailed technical, financial and operational modelling, with and without a district transfer station. See Table 2.

Table 2. Proposed options for modelling

Option	Without transfer station	With transfer station in District
Option 1 - Current service BAU (to calibrate model)	✓	
Option 3 - Rear Loading Vehicles (RLVs) + dry recycling fortnightly & residual weekly	✓	✓
Option 4 - RLVs + Alternate Weekly Collections (AWC)	✓	✓
Option 6 - RLVs + dry recycling weekly & residual fortnightly	✓	✓
Option 8 - Kerbside sort + residual fortnightly		✓
Option 10 - RLVs + Food waste & 3-weekly residual & dry recycling fortnightly	✓	✓

3.6 The detailed shortlist of options was presented back to Members in July 2016. It was concluded that the preference which provided both significant efficiency savings to the council and encouraged an increase in recycling rates reducing the environmental impact of the service was to move to an already tried and tested system i.e. AWCs for collecting residual household waste and using rear loading vehicles.

3.7 The full Ricardo report is attached as Exempt Appendix 1.

3.8 AWC is not a new concept; over 75% of local authorities across the UK¹⁰ have introduced them over the last ten years for household waste collections. The underlying principle of an AWC is that residents still receive a weekly collection, but these are alternated between residual household waste one week and the collection of mixed dry recycling the following week. The garden waste collection scheme (brown lidded bin) this will continue unchanged; so many households will in fact receive three collections a fortnight.

3.9 It is noted that every new scheme goes through a period of transition as the arrangements bed in and residents become familiar with collection cycles. The introduction of an AWC scheme needs to be managed with adequate support aligned to project delivery, publicity and communication with the public.

3.10 An increase in the quality of recycle material will generate not only a higher district recycling rate, but also deliver an additional income stream for the council under the Recycling Payment Mechanism Memorandum of Understanding.

Implementation plan

3.11 The proposed implementation of the AWC service will commence with pre-launch communication in September 2017, in preparation for a scheduled start of AWCs in early

¹⁰ WRAP statistics 2016

2018. The draft implementation timeline with indicative dates is detailed in Table 3 below. AWC will be 'phased', in for a smoother transition.

Table 3. Outline of implementation activity

Activity	Date
Waste Review - All Member seminars	24 November 2015 29 February 2016 4 July 2016
Cabinet member Policy Development Advisory Group meetings (PDAG) Clean & Tidy Advisory Group) (CATAG)	15 February 2016 (25 April 2016 (CATAG) 29 September 2016 3 November 2016
Cabinet Recommendation approval	24 November 2016
Communications activity commences and continues through to implementation	16 November 2016 24 November 2016
Fleet specification for tender /procurement using either a framework agreement or OJEU.	December 2016 to January 2017
Capital and revenue budget approval at Cabinet and Council	26 January 2017 Cabinet 15 February 2017 Council
Round Design / Route Optimisation	March to June 2017
Changes to service resources / staff structure	February 2017 to January 2018
Launch Publicity for new Service / Request Applications for larger Bins (criteria met)	September 2017
Provision of additional Contact Centre Resource	February 2017 to May 2018
Carry out Waste audits / education	Commence September 2017
Deliver larger bins where necessary (dispensation criteria)	January and February 2018
Phased implementation of new Service (including day change)	February 2018 to end May 2018
Ongoing support to residents	September 2017 to Summer 2018
Monitor impact/review implementation/refine	Summer 2018

Policy changes

3.12 In selecting AWC with RELs as the preferred option, it is considered that some of the Council's waste collection policies need to be amended as follows:

3.13 The Standard Service for the collection of domestic waste from individual properties will become an alternate weekly service using as illustrated in the graphic below:

- 140 litre wheeled bins for residual waste (green lid).
- 240 litre wheeled bins for dry recycling (blue lid).
- 240 litre wheeled bins for garden waste collected fortnightly (brown lid).



- 3.14 The correct bin must be used for the right type of waste. The bins provided must not be used to dispose of business waste.
- 3.15 Under the proposals, households will continue to use their 240-litre blue lidded (mixed dry recycling) bin and their 140-litre green lidded (residual waste) bin. Residents can request additional capacity for residual waste based on the criteria set out below in 3.16. When such additional capacity is agreed, the existing residual waste wheeled bin will be exchanged for a larger/additional wheeled bin free of charge. All households that request additional capacity will be asked to complete a declaration to show how they meet the criteria. Checks are likely to be made on any application and may include:
- A waste audit to ensure the household is utilising the recycling bins as much as possible.
 - A check on the names listed permanently residing at the property.
 - Site visits to provide education and advice and ensure the information is still relevant.
 - Additional capacity will only be approved on the agreement that the household makes full use of the recycling service. Additional capacity will be supplied on a conditional basis, which will be reviewed periodically. If circumstances have changed, the additional capacity may be removed.
- 3.16 A new exceptions policy (similar to that used by other councils where AWC is the methodology) will also provide additional bin capacity for those households that meet one of the criteria below:
- Medical needs.
 - Households with six or more permanent residents.
 - Households of five residents with one child in nappies.
 - Households with three or more children in nappies.
- 3.17 Issuing larger bins to qualifying properties will reduce the level of savings that can be delivered, due to the capital cost of providing the bins. This cannot be quantified until implementation is complete.
- 3.18 As a key driver of this collection change is to increase recycling rates and encourage more waste out of the residual waste bin, some residents may require more recycling capacity. Either this can be achieved through the issue of robust bags for recycling which can be left alongside the blue lidded wheelie bins or additional 140L blue lidded recycling bins can be provided free (with a £5 delivery charge) for householders requiring more recycling capacity.

Communications Plan

- 3.19 A communications plan will support the implementation of the new service to ensure a successful rollout across the district. The plan will aim to ensure that all residents are well informed about what the collection changes mean for them.
- 3.20 Different household types will be impacted by the service change in different ways. The communications plan will therefore seek to ensure that each household will receive the right information at the right time.
- 3.21 The Council will use a broad range of channels throughout the campaign. The most significant activity will be a direct mail communication with a calendar to all affected households. This will be supported by an extensive media advertising and editorial campaign; engaging through the full range of social media platforms; website updates; face to face door-stepping engagement and work with parishes and partners.
- 3.22 The audience groups will be carefully segmented and detailed consideration will be given to each.
- 3.23 At the same time, the communications plan will recognise that different groups within the population will have different motivations and recycling behaviours. Carefully tailored messages will seek to engage with and influence particular groups and re-inforce the value of positive behaviours.
- 3.24 A detailed and updated communication plan will be prepared and agreed in consultation with the Portfolio Holder based on this outline plan.
- 3.25 A draft Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document (Appendix 4) has been developed to provide initial information about the introduction of an AWC scheme. This will be further developed as the implementation of the waste collection system develops.

4 Next Steps

- 4.1 If the recommendation is approved to introduce AWCs the council will produce detailed implementation plans for key elements of delivering the new service. The main tasks are referred to in Table 3. Key project areas consist of:
- Operational changes
 - Round and route optimisation
 - Fleet Procurement
 - Communication and awareness/education
 - Human Resource/employment arrangements
- 4.2 In delivering the project the council will continually seek to minimise inconvenience and disruption to our residents. A communications campaign which will ensure all households are well informed of the new arrangements, including any change to their scheduled weekday collection is proposed in 2017/18. A large part of this will also involve offering reminder information and advice about what can be recycled and how to reduce household waste.

5 Views of the Waste, Recycling and Cleansing Policy Development Advisory Group and Outcome of Consultations

- 5.1 The Cabinet Member's Waste, Recycling and Cleansing PDAG has been consulted through the options assessment work. Three PDAGs have specifically discussed the emerging preferred option and general support was received for the proposal to move to AWC and to procure REL vehicles. Members have stressed the importance of properly resourcing the communications strategy, preparation and transition work to ensure disruption to residents is minimised.

6 Other Courses of Action Considered but Rejected

- 6.1 The options work undertaken by Ricardo Consulting considered ten options as referred to in Table 1 of this report. This included carrying on with existing weekly collections for residual household waste and the continued use of side loader vehicles.
- 6.2 The council could continue to use side-loader vehicles and weekly collection of residual waste. However, further investment is required to make the existing side loader collection methodology work, which is estimated to cost an additional £290k per annum to the projected 2018/19 budget, due to increase in fleet vehicles and cost.
- 6.3 The council could change to use RELs and continue with weekly residual waste collections. Whilst this would save an estimated £270k per annum in 2018/19, additional savings of £730k would not be achieved, so this has been rejected in favour of the preferred option.

7 Resource Consequences

- 7.1 The implementation of AWC using RELs will deliver an estimated saving of circa £1m per annum. The actual saving will be dependent upon several factors including:
- The use of Rear Loading Vehicles (REL's) to carry out the operation and the impact this will have on the structure of our workforce.
 - Route optimisation and re-modelling to quantify the number of rounds required to deliver the new service and incorporate new housing growth.

Actual savings will not become clear until the end of 2018/19 when the new service has bedded in.

- 7.2 The capital costs of the new fleet are already in the Capital Programme in a £3.8m allocation for vehicle replacement. Because RELs are cheaper than side loaders and we will need fewer vehicles by moving to AWC, we will recalculate this estimate in preparing the 2017/18-2019/20 Capital Programme. If Cabinet approve the recommendations in this report, we will create a separate line in the capital programme, specifically for REL refuse vehicles, and reduce the general vehicle replacement budget line. Council will consider the 2017/18-2019/20 Capital Programme in February 2017. We will not know the final cost of these vehicles until we have received tenders following a competitive tendering process.

Implementation Costs

- 7.3 The implementation costs arising from this project as referred to in Table 4 below. These costs do not include all general officer time and resources.

Table 4

Activity	Cost	Comments
Providing additional communications	£90k	
Providing additional Contact Centre support	£ 4k	Additional resource required during implementation phase officers for 16 weeks (4 months)
Delivery of additional/replacement bins for larger families meeting dispensation criteria or purchase of additional recycling bins	£100k	Needs quantifying if we supply larger bins
Providing additional front line resource to facilitate the transition of the service change	£36k	Additional REL Crew to deal with any operational issues plus additional 2 x staff to problem solve educate as roll out progresses
Additional HR costs	£20k	Reviewing and potentially amending 70 staff's T&Cs and contracts, in consultation with Trade Unions, including re-configuring rotas, training and the skill mix.
Total	£250k	

- 7.4 We will fund the implementation costs from the Transformation Reserve. The scale of these costs is containable within the reserve but the Accounts, Audit and Governance Committee may need to consider a top up when closing the accounts for 2016/17 to fund other transformation projects to address the Council's underlying budget deficit.

Staffing implications

- 7.5 The main impact of the shift to RELs will be to change the structure of the workforce in this service to fewer drivers and more loaders. At this stage we cannot fully rule out that some posts may be at risk of redundancy, until we are clear on route optimisation, crew numbers, and skill mix required. We do not anticipate that this would affect many posts and potentially voluntary measures, re-training/ re-deployment and transition/ protection periods would apply to limit the impact on staff, subject to full consultation with individuals and trade unions.

Overall there will be an increase in the number of posts. Impact on staff will be mitigated by early workforce planning and early consultation on proposed changes. Management are already covering any gaps in staffing through the use of fixed term contracts and agency staff.

- 7.6 Transitional arrangements will also require temporary resources to support the implementation of the new service as detailed in Table 4. Adequate HR resources will be identified to support establishing the new arrangements, including collective and individual consultations on changes to working practices and rotas, potentially contractual arrangements, redundancies, new skill mix and recruitment activities.

- 7.7 All staff that may be affected by these proposals were informed w/c 14 Nov 2016. Any changes to the service affecting staffing structures will follow the processes set out in the Council's Organisational Change Framework.

8 Legal Consequences

- 8.1 Section 45 of the Environmental Protection Act 1980 places a duty on the Council to collect household waste. There is nothing in the Act or any other regulation relating to it imposing any particular frequency of waste collection. In addition, the Council is able to specify the size and nature of containers that can be used by residents for the presentation of their waste under Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act. The proposed AWC service complies with these duties.
- 8.2 The Council must meet the requirements of the European Commission's Waste Framework Directive (WFD) and Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 – Recycling Collections and Material Streams. In particular, if the Council does not carry out separate kerbside collections of papers, glass, cans and plastic, it must prove that:
- The co-mingled collection service delivers material to the equivalent quality of a separate kerbside collection (the Necessity Test) or;
 - That it is not Technically, Environmentally and/or Economically Practicable (TEEP) to do so.
- 8.3 Any proposed change of service must be TEEP compliant. The current proposal only affects the frequency of residual household waste collections (blue lidded bins) and not the recycling service although it is anticipated that the recycling rate will increase as a consequence of these changes.

9 Risk Assessment

- 9.1 There are significant risks involved with the changes to front line services, particularly services that affect every household in the district. The following information highlights risks that have been identified and details how the risks will be mitigated.
- 9.2 Public acceptance: Some residents will view the new service as a reduction in service delivery and may be reluctant to cope with and accept service change. This will be mitigated by support from the waste recycling team.
- 9.3 Concerns over matters such as hygiene/smell, vermin, pests, flies and maggots etc. These are common concerns with the introduction of AWC but positive communications and education will help to mitigate this. Over 75% of local authorities have introduced alternate weekly collections and whilst many of these authorities also provide separate weekly food waste collections from the kerbside, many don't. Rutland Council does not provide separate food collections but still achieves, through AWC, a 60% recycling rate and is ranked in the top ten of all local authorities in the UK (Table 6. Exempt Ricardo report). Initial concerns can be overcome by advising householders to wrap food waste prior to disposal and ensure bin lids are kept closed. The Department of Health and the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health have confirmed that "there is no evidence of increased health risks by implementing AWC, provided food waste is adequately dealt with"¹¹. In 2007 a review by Cranfield University and Enviro¹², found "no evidence that alternate week waste collection will cause any significant health impacts for residents, or that any health impacts are likely to be significantly greater than those associated with weekly

¹¹ Communities and Local Government Committee, Refuse Collection, Fifth Report of Session 2006–07, HC 536i

¹² Health impact assessment of alternate week waste collections of biodegradable waste, Cranfield University and Enviro Consulting Limited, February 2007

collections". More recent research¹³ presents a review of international research into waste collections commissioned by WRAP and the Chartered Institution of Waste Management (CIWM). The report's findings have confirmed existing advice for councils and householders on avoiding risks to public health. No evidence was found that changing to a fortnightly collection creates risks that cannot be dealt with by following the good practice guidance.

- 9.4 Cross Contamination: The capacity for residual waste will reduce, which may lead to an increased risk of cross contamination into the recycling and garden waste streams. Excessive contamination and particularly food waste deposited in the recycling bin can have a significant impact on recycling percentages and costs. In some cases, whole loads can become contaminated and sent to landfill or the MBT plant rather than recycled. Increased communications and collection monitoring using the in-cab technology system will be required to minimise the risk.
- 9.5 Round Reviews: In order to optimise operational efficiencies, collection rounds will be reviewed and re-modelled moving towards area based working. It is anticipated that some households will experience a change to their current collection day. However, if possible we would like to introduce a new scheme which keeps the day of collection the same irrespective of what material is collected. At the start of the new service it is likely a minority of households will place their bins for collection on the wrong day. While this should be a short-term risk, good communications and providing additional Contact Centre resource and scaling up staffing levels during the initial period will help mitigate the risk.
- 9.6 Increased Customer Contacts: During the led up to the implementation of the new service it is likely there will be a significant increase in calls to the Contact Centre and demands for waste audits, with members of the public seeking clarification about the new service and requesting larger bins etc. This risk will be mitigated by recruiting additional temporary Contact Centre staff to deal with these enquiries.
- 9.7 Waste Framework Directive (WFD): There is a minimal risk of legal challenge under the WFD if co-mingled (where all types of recycling plastic, cans, glass, paper) collections fail to comply with the standards required under the TEEP process. Were such a challenge to be successful it would be necessary to introduce kerbside sort collections. However, the detailed options analysis undertaken by Ricardo identified a minimal impact on recycling from co-mingling as all materials are sorted at the MRF. Sorting along many of the rural roads would put staff at serious risk if undertaking such an operation on the roadside. Therefore, we are satisfied that these proposals meet TEEP requirements.
- 9.8 Staff risks – in changing the skills mix of the workforce there are risks that we cannot recruit the right staff at the right time. This risk is mitigated by early consultation with staff and Unions and we will introduce an early recruitment campaign should the likelihood of this risk rise.
- 9.9 Procuring a new vehicle fleet presents risks in terms of ensuring the vehicle specification is correct and lead in procurement times which, given the size of the capital investment, can be lengthy. It essential that this area of work is prioritised and started as soon as possible.

10 Other Considerations

10.1 The proposal has no impact on the council's position linked to Crime, Disorder

Sustainability- fewer journeys, reduction in carbon emissions, route optimisation

The move to AWC will bring much wider environmental benefits such as:

- Less kilometres travelled by our refuse collection fleet
- Fuel efficiency savings
- Reducing landfill by increasing recycling
- Reduction in CO² emissions

10.2 Equalities Impact Assessment attached Appendix 3

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2. Comparison of Side-loading vehicle system vs Standard rear loading vehicles

Side loader	Standard REL
High capital replacement cost;	Lower capital costs;
Driver in cab no operatives at the rear of vehicle	Working at rear of vehicle operatives on highway. elevated risk of contact with traffic
Single sided collection working reduces crossing of highway	Single sided working can still be applied as well as double sided dependant on street risk
Improved salary payment with overall budget saving (2 drivers)	Staffing budget higher. Driver and 2 loaders (urban only)
Reduced manual handling	Increased manual handling,
Spot hire market non-existent;	Spot hire availability good across a range of tonnages
Payload only 7 tons	Increased Payload 10.8 tons
Enhanced collections pass rate in urban areas	Standard REL pass rate lower however enhanced collections points compensate
Very limited manufacturer demountable system available- only one manufacturer available in UK	Multiple manufacturers
High frontline costs including fuel, Maintenance. Specialist parts	Lower frontline costs, fuel, maintenance, generic parts
Performance restrictions against warranty Number of lifts reduced to 800 per day.	Unrestricted number of lifts against warranty.
System operated by HDC as 2 LGV driver model- training complex costly	Driver training much simpler; Less reliance on LGV drivers
Infrastructure costs high requires transfer points at 4 locations across district 3 of which have rental costs.	No additional transfer station rental costs, less stress on driver,
Reduced interaction with customers and public	Increased customer contact,
System takes the collection methodology into the public domain – collection from footpaths etc.	Reduced risk of injury to public as collections are undertaken on highway.
Wheeled bin damage high attrition caused by inertial forces of lifting arm.	Reduced inertial force on wheeled bins less damage.
UK product support poor, parts supply lead times high.	Parts and product support good.
Niche specialist product	Non-niche product.
High fuel consumption	Improved fuel efficiency.
System incompatible with other authorities	Shared services more achievable with other authorities. Future proof option if service outsourced.
System requires high degree of maintenance input as a whole	Increased driver maintenance need to revise Driver contract
Vehicle movements restricted to 4 tugs out of district	Increased vehicle numbers out of district travelling. due to lack of transfer facilities,
Reduced reversing as vehicles cannot operate in differing scenarios – width defines operation.	Increased reversing manoeuvres vehicles have greater access
2 supplier chain, chassis, body	Potential to have 3 supplier chain; body, chassis, bin lift
Training costs high. No agency cover available due to specialist system. left hand drive vehicles and joy stick control.	Equipment less complex; agency drivers can be integrated quickly
Multiple points of risk related to mount – demount	Non-complex system, easier to control risks
Higher driver stress levels. Complex for operator/drive	Reduced driver stress levels standard HGV driver requirements

Appendix 3 Equalities Impact Assessment - Waste Review – Alternate Weekly Collections

<p>Names of Team members (min of 2 – Author, manager and or staff member/equality lead) and Lead Officer/Director</p>	<p>Natalie Brahma-Pearl: Project Sponsor; John McArthur: Service Manager, Clive Burley: Project Manager</p>
<p>Consultation mechanism (names of equality groups liaised with)i.e. Access Forum, Staff Group</p>	<p>An all member workshop was held on 24th November 2015 and subsequent workshops refined service principles and options. The Waste and Recycling PDAG has advised and been consulted throughout the Waste Review process on 30th June, 13th and 29th September and 3rd November 2016.</p>
<p>Date Equality Impact Assessment submitted to ratifying committee</p>	<p>Cabinet 24th November 2016</p>
<p>Are there resource implications to deliver actions from this EIA? If yes, please detail</p>	<p>There are significant resource implications to ensure the change to Alternate Weekly Collections is communicated, understood and that support is provided to residents to ensure its success.</p> <p>Please refer to Table 4 of the main report.</p>
<p>Name of policy/strategy</p>	<p>Introduction of Alternate Weekly Collections for residual waste (AWC)</p>
<p>Aim of policy/strategy (maximum 100 words)</p>	<p>Over two-thirds of local authorities now operate alternate weekly refuse and recycling collections. The change to alternate weekly collections will encourage higher recycling rates and reduce the amount of waste sent to more expensive treatment facilities. It is well documented that AWC is a proven method for achieving increased levels of recycling. Evidence shows that recycling is increased by restricting the frequency and capacity of residual waste collections.</p> <p>The Council is required to meet national recycling targets of 50% by 2020 which requires a revision to our current waste strategy to achieve this.</p>

Impact Assessment

Does the policy/strategy target or exclude a particular equality group listed?

(Consider Direct Discrimination)

Race	No
Disability/carers	No
Gender/gender identity	No
Age	No
Sexual orientation	No
Religion & Belief	No
Marriage & Civil Partnership	No
Gender Reassignment	No
Pregnancy & Maternity	No

The council has a statutory duty to provide a refuse and recycling service to all households within the borough by virtue of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Section 45 places a duty on each waste collection authority to arrange for the collection of household waste in its area except waste which is situated at a place which in the opinion of the authority is so isolated or inaccessible that the cost of collecting it would be unreasonably high, and as to which the authority is satisfied that adequate arrangements for its disposal have been or can reasonably be expected to be made by a person who controls the waste.

Under Section 46 all local authorities are entitled to stipulate the method of refuse collection and place other restrictions upon the collection of domestic waste.

Whilst there is a statutory duty to deliver the refuse and recycling service, the way in which the service is delivered is defined by the council.

Does the policy/strategy affect any of the equality groups listed disproportionately?

(Consider Indirect Discrimination)

(List all negative and positive impacts)

Race	Yes
Disability/carers	Yes
Gender/gender identity	No
Age	Yes
Sexual orientation	No
Religion & Belief	No
Marriage & Civil Partnership	No
Gender Reassignment	No

Race: If English is not a first language for some parts of the community then the communications relating to AWC may not be understood.

Disability: There may be an adverse impact as the move to AWC will result in bins becoming heavier than normal to move. The Council will continue to publicise the Assisted Collection Scheme - Elderly, infirm or disabled residents may request an assisted collection for their refuse, recycling and garden waste bins if they are unable to move their bins to the designated collection point.

Pregnancy & Maternity	No	<p>Gender/Gender Identity: There are no adverse impacts.</p> <p>Age: There may be an adverse impact as the move to AWC will result in bins becoming heavier than normal to move. The Council will continue to publicise the Assisted Collection Scheme.</p> <p>Sexual Orientation: There are no adverse impacts.</p> <p>Religion & Belief: There are no adverse impacts.</p> <p>Marriage & Civil Partnership: There are no adverse impacts.</p> <p>Gender Reassignment: There are no adverse impacts.</p> <p><u>Exceptions Policy</u>: The policy will provide for additional bin capacity where the following criteria are deemed to have been met:</p> <p>Medical needs. Households with six or more permanent residents. Households of five residents with one child in nappies. Households with three or more children in nappies.</p>
-----------------------	----	---

What evidence has been used to make these judgements? Please tick one or more

Demographic data and other statistics, including census findings	Yes	A review of other local authority impact statements; current Council policies and Equalities Officer review.
Information from groups/agencies/consultation/research within Horsham District	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comparisons between similar functions / policies either internally or with other District Councils	Yes	
Analysis of complaints/public enquiries information/audits or reviews	<input type="checkbox"/>	

How is the effect of the policy/strategy on different equality groups going to be monitored? Please specify for each equality group

Race		An extensive communications strategy will be put in place before, during and after the introduction of the new service. All households will receive an information pack on the change to AWC and specifically which bin to put out each week and on which day.
Disability/carer		
Gender/gender identity		Appropriate information will be cascaded through all media – print and digital including the Council’s main website. Information will be made
Age		
Sexual orientation		
Religion & Belief		

Marriage & Civil Partnership	
Gender Reassignment	
Pregnancy & Maternity	

available in a variety of languages and formats.

It is important that the Communications Strategy provides information in appropriate formats and locations to reach potentially negatively impacted equality groups – for example people with visual impairment or a learning disability.

Does the document have an access statement offering the document in alternative formats for disabled people? Yes If no, please add to action plan as evidence that this assessment has assisted.	Do staff dealing with this document know where to get alternative formats if a request is made? Yes If no, please add awareness training needed to action plan (Equalities Officer can provide)	Does the document need to be translated into key locally used languages? Yes – As part of the Communications Strategy If yes, how will this be distributed and funded?
--	---	--

Action Plan (to reduce or eliminate any adverse impacts)

Equality Strand	Action and Resources	Lead Person	Timescale
Race	Translation of Information Packs into key locally used languages and upon request. Provision of information in a visual format	Alison Turner	As required
Age	Promotion of the Assisted Collections Service	John McArthur	As required
Disability	Promotion of the Assisted Collections Service	John McArthur	As required
All Strands	Monitor enquiries received from Customer Care Contact Team and Press Office and	Alison Turner & David Plank	As required

	<p>respond as appropriate.</p> <p>Relevant Contact Centre support staff to receive equalities training as part of transition to AWC.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Appendix 4.

Draft FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS Changes to Household Waste Collections (AWC)

Q1. Why is Horsham District Council proposing to change the way my rubbish/ recycling is collected?

We want to reduce the impact on the environment by increasing the amount of waste we all recycle

Since April 2015 West Sussex residents have been able to recycle plastic, pots and trays, in addition to paper, card, tins and glass, greatly increasing the amount we can all now recycle. Putting more recyclable materials in your recycling bins will help to increase the District's recycling rate. We currently recycle 45% of all our waste and we aim to reach 50% by 2020.

This revised service will help us all to recycle more of our household rubbish and help to keep down the cost of waste disposal for tax payers. By recycling more we can reduce this bill and spend your money on other services you value.

Q2. What exactly are the proposed changes to the refuse collection service? How will it work?

We are proposing to collect household rubbish on an 'alternate weekly collection service'. This means your recycling is collected one week, and your household rubbish is collected the next week.

You will continue to receive a collection from your home on a weekly basis.

- Mixed recycling is collected from your blue-top wheelie bin.
- Household rubbish is collected from your green-top wheelie bin.
- Recycling is collected one week and rubbish the next week.
- For those who subscribe to our garden waste collection once every fortnight, you will continue to receive this service as you do now.

Q3. Does this mean a reduction in the service I was previously receiving?

We will still be collecting from your home on a weekly basis and, for those who subscribe to it, your green waste fortnightly. I am sure you have all noticed how much more material you are now putting in your recycling bin. As we can all now recycle more, as long as you separate your waste into the appropriate bins there should be sufficient space in your wheelie bin each week.

Q4. Is this scheme unique to the Horsham district?

No. It has been in operation in England and Wales for a number of years. Over 75% of local authorities now use an alternate weekly collection system and this figure continues to grow.

Q5. How will I know which containers to put out on which week?

An information pack will be delivered to your home before we introduce the scheme. This pack will tell you exactly when the scheme will start and which bin you will need to put out each week. The information will also be made available online via your [Personalised Waste and Recycling Calendar](#).

Q6. Where will my bin be collected from?

Your bins will continue to be collected from their existing collection points. You are asked to place your bin out for collection by 6am on your scheduled day of collection. Bins will be returned to their collection point.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to Cabinet

24 November 2016

By the Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling & Cleansing



Key Decision

DECISION REQUIRED

Not exempt

Proposal to increase fees for the Green Waste collection service

Executive Summary

With continuing pressures on the Council's budget and the on-going challenge this presents to future service delivery, in particular discretionary services, it is necessary that where possible services generate sufficient revenue to cover their cost of delivery.

The purpose of this report is to recommend a small increase in the Green Waste subscription charge which is made for the Garden Waste collection service.

If Cabinet agrees to proceed with a fee increase then this will take effect from 1 April 2017.

Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to approve the following recommendations:

- i) Agree to the increase in Green Waste collection charges to take effect from 1st April 2017. The first bin collection at £39.50 per annum (if paid via the contact centre or post) or discounted to £37 per annum (if paid by on-line payment/Direct Debit).
- ii) Agree that the fee for additional green waste wheelie bin collections is increased from £20 to £25 per additional bin.
- iii) Delegate authority to the Director of Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing to make any consequential amendments to the Green Waste Terms and Conditions.
- iv) Note that the proposed changes will result in approximately £106,500 additional revenue for the 2017/18 financial year.

Reasons for Recommendations

- i) In line with the existing Green Waste Terms of Reference, the service is subject to an annual price review.
- ii) Additional green waste bins collected from properties are subject to an annual price review
- iii) The current Terms and Conditions of the service will need to be amended to reflect the new charges and inclusion of any minimal service charges related to payment by credit card
- iv) Due to the improved revenue position from the scheme to amend the 2017/18 budget for the service accordingly.

Background Papers

Cabinet report 19 December 2012. Green Waste Opt-in scheme

Cabinet report 23 November 2015. Green Waste collection fee increase

Contact: Natalie Brahma-Pearl. Director of Community Services tel. 01403 215250.

Background Information

1 Introduction and background

- 1.1 The current scheme, introduced in June 2013, has been a success with 31,773 (or 62% of all) households participating in 2016/17. In addition 2,362 customers purchased a second bin. Projected revenue for 2016/17 is £1,159k which is £45k above the 2016/17 budgeted revenue of £1,115k due to a higher level of demand than originally budgeted for.

2 Relevant Council policy

- 2.1 The report supports the priorities in Corporate Plan 2016 – 2019
- Communities - Support our communities
 - Economy - Improve and support the local economy
 - Efficiency - Great value services
 - Environmental - manage our natural and built environment

3 Details

- 3.1 **The local picture-** Many councils nationally and all other councils in West Sussex charge for green waste collections with local charges ranging from our current £35 to £65 per annum 2016/17. A summary of the schemes operated by neighbouring councils is detailed below in Table 1.

Table 1. Neighbouring Council Green Waste charges

Authority	Cost for Green Waste Collections 2016/17	Comments
Horsham	£35	Additional bins £20 each/£37.50 non-direct debit and via telephone.
Crawley	£49	Runs for 9 months from March to November only
Mid Sussex	£65 per year	The Customer can only pay by Direct Debit only.
Adur	£65	Single scheme across Adur & Worthing.
Worthing	£65	
Arun	£63.50 per year	(+£7.50 transaction charge is added to credit card payments made by telephone). Part of a "Green Waste Club" Scheme that encourages composting. Customer subscription 12 month (£63.50 x1), 24 month (£57.15 x2) or 36 month (£50.80 x3) periods.
Chichester	£49	Price for payment by Direct Debit only, £56.50 otherwise.
Mole Valley	£53	£53 per bin – DD only. max number of bins three per household. Each bin to be purchased at £40 for new service entry which is partly refundable.

3.2 Cabinet is asked to agree a £2 increase to the Green Waste collection charge and an increase of £5 for subsequent bins.

3.3 Effect on recycling

3.4 The increase in the collection charge may impact on the number of households participating in the scheme with a possible reduction in the recycling rate. However, recent changes to opening times at the West Sussex County Council Household Waste & Recycling Facilities may well encourage more residential uptake. During 2016/17, we have seen an average monthly increase in the tonnage of green waste collected from 1,209 tons per month in 2015/16 to currently 1,354 tons per month in 2016/17. Horsham still recycles nearly twice the green waste tonnage of all other District and Borough council areas across West Sussex.

3.5 Even if less green waste is collected by the Council this does not mean it will not be recycled. A number of residents will take up or increase home composting and many will take their green waste to be Household Waste Recycling Centres at Hop Oast and Billingshurst from where it will be composted. As access to these sites has decreased we may well see a neutral or even small increase in residential sign up given the excellent value for money the service provides set against increased queuing time at the West Sussex County Council sites.

3.6 It is also unlikely that there will be an increase in the amount of waste collected in the residual waste stream. This is due to diversion routes outlined above, the small size of the residual waste bin and our powers to refuse to accept mixed waste. The Environmental Protection Act 1990 section 46 paragraph (11) allows Councils to refuse to accept residual waste bins that contain garden waste thus further reducing the likelihood of diverting garden waste to landfill.

3.7 On-line payments discount:

3.8 In 2016/17, we introduced an online payment discount to try to change customer behaviour and reduce the administrative cost burden of non-on-line and non-Direct Debit payments. Those paying by Direct Debit or on-line for the service qualify for a reduced fee of £37 per annum. Those not paying by either of these methods will be charged £39.50 per annum with the additional cost covering higher transaction costs including the appointment of temporary staff during the renewal period.

3.9 The processing cost of transactions through the call centre is estimated to be approximately £2.83 per transaction and £5.95-£6.62 (Google) for postal transactions compared to a web transaction of 15 pence. We anticipate that the number of subscriptions processed through the customer services contact centre will remain at around the 1,900 level, which is less than 6% of all customers.

4 Next steps

4.1 If the revised charges are agreed, steps will be taken to amend the Terms and Condition of the scheme as appropriate to reflect any minor service charges applied for customers who pay by credit cards.

4.2 Customers will be contacted informing them of the revised charges for the service as a whole and Direct Debit instructions can be revised and issued to customers.

4.3 The service will continue to be marketed using appropriate media channels.

5 Views of the Policy Development Advisory Group and outcome of consultations

- 5.1 The proposed price increases and assumptions were considered by the Waste Policy Development and Advisory Group at its meeting on November 3rd 2016 and the Group was supportive of the proposals.
- 5.2 The Monitoring Officer's comments have been incorporated into this report. The Director of Corporate Resources comments that the proposed increase in fees will help resolve the Council's projected deficit outlined in its Medium Term Financial Strategy.

6 Other courses of action considered but rejected

- 6.1 Holding the subscription fee at £35 and £20 (additional bins) was considered but discounted due to the cost of the collection service increasing. The cost of delivering the service has increased due to a rise in salaries, pensions and vehicle running costs. In addition to increased overheads and running costs the council has committed an additional collection vehicle and crew to deal with peak service demands and associated increases in green waste tonnages some of which is attributed to promotional campaigns aimed at increasing kerbside recycling. It is also necessary that those using the service should pay to cover the cost of provision.

7 Financial consequences

- 7.1 A number of assumptions have been used when calculating the expected positive impact on the revenue budget 2017/18. These can be seen in Table 2 below. Currently 31,773 properties participate in the scheme of which a 1% reduction has been applied assuming that some customers may no longer continue with the service. In addition 2,362 customers purchase a two bin service, of which a 1% reduction in take up is also assumed in the calculations below.
- 7.2 The increase costs will generate an additional £106.5k per annum.

Table 2. Revenue projections

	2016/17		2017/18	Revised revenue return
Customers Households	31,773 (actual)		31,455 (Minus 1% participation)	
First bin	31,773 @ £35	£1,112,055	31,455@ £37	£1,163,835
Second bin	2,362 @£20	£47,240	2,338 x @£25	£58,450
Current 2016/17 Budget	2016/17 Budget £1,115,745	£1,159,295 (actual)		
Projected revised 2017/18 Budget				£1,222,285 (-£106,540)

- 7.3 The decision to implement a charge increase should be taken into context in light of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

8 Legal consequences

Statutory background

- 8.1 The collection of Green waste is a discretionary, non-statutory service. Green Waste collections is a service for which, under Section 45 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and detailed in The Controlled Waste Regulations 2012, the Council can at its discretion levy a charge.
- 8.2 Section 4, Schedule 1 of The Controlled Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012 (as amended), specifies that garden waste is household waste for which a charge for collection may be made.
- 8.3 Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (as amended) specifies that the council may specify the type of container and the waste which is placed in the container and also specifies that the authority is not obliged to collect the waste in contravention of these requirements.

9 Staffing Consequences

- 9.1 There are no establishment staffing consequences resulting from this decision. However, given the shift to more on-line and Direct Debit transactions it is possible that fewer temporary staff will be required during the renewal period.

10 Risk Assessment

- 10.1 The participation rate is lower than the anticipated, with greater than 1% drop out of customers resulting in a lower income than projected.
- 10.2 Recycling rates could reduce as a consequence of fewer customers participating in the scheme. However, as stated above, some residents will deposit their garden waste at West Sussex County Council Household Waste and Recycling sites HWRS which will feed into the County wide recycling figures

11 Other Considerations

- 11.1 There are no consequences of any action proposed in respect of Crime & Disorder or Human Rights.
- 11.2 Equality & Diversity
- The service is available to all. Home composting or use of the HWRS remains an option for those not wishing to participate in the scheme.
 - Assisted collections will be offered under the same terms as existing for other collections.
 - Customers without access to a computer/internet can still benefit from the discounted rate by paying for the service by Direct Debit.
 - Computer terminals/internet access is provided in local libraries and the council reception area.

11.3 Sustainability.

- The service will continue to collect green garden waste for composting and seek to promote home composting for those who decide not to participate
- The service could result in a reduction in car usage as householders may make fewer trips to household waste recycling sites. This is a positive impact and therefore would not require mitigation.
- The service could result in a reduction in air pollution as householders may choose to recycle green waste where previously they may have burned some of this material.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to Cabinet

24th November 2016

By the Cabinet Member for the Local Economy

Not Exempt



Rural Car Parking arrangements

Executive Summary

Given significant financial pressures placed on the Council due to the complete withdrawal of Government Revenue Support Grant by 2019/20, the Council needs to identify ways to close the funding gap. Currently, rural car parks are subsidised by approximately £315k per annum, however this excludes any future investment costs for any major improvements such as expansion or re-configuration. The purpose of this report is to seek cabinet approval to change the way rural parks are operated so that the operating costs can be mitigated. In addition, this report proposes a standardised approach across the district in how they are operated which addresses the current range of complex arrangements in place. Certain villages act as retail hubs primarily for convenience shopping. It is difficult to gauge the willingness of consumers to pay for the convenience of shopping locally; however, the pricing suggested in this report is such that we believe it will not inhibit consumers' willingness to do so.

The key benefits of this proposal will be improved control which will raise the level of turnover in car parks and free up spaces for more shoppers, with greater enforcement to ensure parkers comply with parking rules.

Recommendations

That the Cabinet is recommended to:

- i) Introduce an annual rural parking disc/permit scheme at £12 for the first car, £6 for subsequent cars registered at the same address (max four discs/permits per address). An additional £2.50 charge will be applied for non-website and non-direct debit transactions). Disc/permits will take effect from Monday 3rd April 2017. These will be applicable in all Council rural car parks as outlined in Appendix 1 between 9am- 6pm Monday-Saturday (unless otherwise stated) and will exclude Sunday's and Bank Holidays.
- ii) Agree to the leasing of smaller rural car parks at a peppercorn rent or offer purchase where appropriate to relevant Parishes where their function supports local community hall and open space activities.
- iii) Standardise the cost at £130 pa for long-term season tickets and introduce these in areas where facilities do not currently exist. This will apply from Monday 3rd April 2017. These will be applicable for use in specific car parks only (as indicated on the season ticket) and will be valid (unless otherwise stated) between 9am-6pm Monday-Saturdays (excluding Sunday's and Bank Holidays).

- iv) Agree to the introduction of Pay & Display facilities from 3rd April 2017 in a number of specific car parks, and agree that an hourly charge for users is set at 75p up to 1 hour, and £1.50 for up to 2-3 hours or a reasonable maximum time to be agreed with local Parish Councils where appropriate. This charge will be applicable in specific rural car parks which have Pay & Display facilities between 9am- 6pm Monday-Saturdays (excluding Sunday's and Bank Holidays) See Appendix 1.
- v) Agree to fund the capital project costs from existing capital budgets that will not be spent in 2016/17. A virement of £77k from existing corporate capital budgets that will not be spent this year will be made to a new capital rural car parking project code to pay for the 11 car parking machines and phone line installation. This will enable the scheme to have the infrastructure in place to go live on 3 April 2017.
- vi) To delegate authority to the Director of Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for the Local Economy, to make any consequential amendments to the implementation of the recommendations contained within this report and undertake a review of the scheme 12 months after implementation.

Reasons for Recommendations

- i) Annual permits are proposed at a small charge to provide convenience to regular users.
- ii) A number of village halls have our car parks immediately located next to them. Our car parks provide the parking facility for such buildings and attached open spaces. In some cases, the business rates of these car parks are integrated into those of the Village/community Hall. In these cases, it is proposed that the car parks are transferred with conditions, free of charge or leased at a peppercorn to each of the relevant Parish Councils.
- iii) The availability of long term car parking is recognised as a key requirement in our rural communities that act as shopping hubs.
- iv) It is recognised that not all users of rural car parks will want to purchase an annual permit or that they may be a visitor to the area.
- v) To agree how implementing the scheme will be funded.
- vi) To ensure the scheme can be implemented within agreed timescales and review is undertaken of the new arrangements in 12 months.

Background Papers

Rural car parking survey July 2016

Parish Council summary notes, Parish Council responses

Rural Households numbers within Horsham District

Last 10 years' capital maintenance costs; Projected 10yr capital maintenance costs

Wards affected: All rural Parishes

Contact: Ben Golds, Parking Services Manager, 01403 215055

Natalie Brahma-Pearl, Director of Community Services 01403 215250

Background Information

1 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 In response to the significant cuts to Government funding, the Council is faced with the challenge of how to address such a funding gap and retain key services. The next two years will see the complete loss of all Revenue Support Grant from government and the need to fund a projected deficit of some £4.2 million. This follows a period when over £7m has been cut from the Council's operating budget. In the light of this huge financial challenge the Council needs to look urgently at ways it can put the delivery of local services onto a footing that will be sustainable in the future. This means introducing mechanisms which enable costs to be recovered for the delivery of some services and for the generation of additional funds to ensure sufficient long term investment can be planned.
- 1.2 The Cabinet Member for the Local Economy has held four discussions with HDC councillors on rural car parking provision over the last 10 months. This has included three Policy Advisory Group meetings and an All Member seminar in (April 2016). During discussions with Members some possible solutions emerged which the Cabinet Member wanted to discuss further with relevant Parish Councils and test whether these would work.
- 1.3 Based on these discussions, we wrote to all local Parish Councils in June 2016 (copied to all HDC councillors) informing them of our review and the need to make the provision of rural car parks cost neutral to the Council. We also hoped to standardise the parking regime across the district's rural car parks as this is currently confusing to users. We also commissioned a survey of our rural car parks which was undertaken in July 2016 to establish the usage pattern of our rural car parks. This information has been used to underpin the proposals and recommendations in this report.

Current arrangements

- 1.4 Each rural car park currently has a different regime in place. In many areas, the purchase of a disc at 50p is required, which once purchased allows unlimited parking for a certain period of time. In some car parks parking is restricted to two hours with no charge/paid for a disc, while in others there is no time restriction whatsoever.
- 1.5 Some car parks have special provision for long stay business users, with a limited number of season tickets available to purchase. However, often this provision is found in the busiest car parks, where the availability of parking space for customers is paramount to the vitality of the local retail offer. In most cases the charges for these season tickets do not come close to covering the actual cost of providing the parking space, effectively resulting in the business users being heavily subsidised by all tax payers across the district whether they own a car or not.
- 1.6 Visitors to our rural car parks are faced with confusing messages about localised arrangements and where to purchase/obtain a disc from and whether they are valid in some car parks.

2 Relevant Council policy

- 2.1 Efficiency – Great Value Services. Supporting the delivery of a balanced budget.
- 2.2 Economy – Improve and support the local economy. Produce and implement a strategy for the management of off street car parks across the district.

3 Details

- 3.1 Although increasing or introducing a charge is never popular, it is important for a number of reasons: Primarily, the Council is looking to reduce the car parks' operating costs, provide appropriate enforcement, and maintain and undertake major repairs. This puts emphasis on the user paying for this, rather than all the district's taxpayers (around 9% of rural households do not own a vehicle). Also, it helps to control the flow of cars entering and exiting the car parks - ensuring regular churn which supports local businesses. This is really important to local traders because if spaces are blocked for the whole day it prevents new customers from being able to park and therefore shop.
- 3.2 The importance of the local retail offer and economic vibrancy has been discussed at every meeting the Cabinet Member and Officers attended with local Parish Councils. It is difficult, when introducing a new scheme to know what the take-up of it will be. While some may see any charge as a problem, this view must be set against the Council's need to address its funding gap. It is clearly important that in setting a charge that this does not deter 'local' shopping.
- 3.3 We initially commenced the rural car parking review seeking standardisation and consistency across our village/rural car parks. What has emerged is that there are basically two broad groupings i) market towns with significant retail shopping provision and community infrastructure and ii) car parks servicing a village hall type function and those giving access to open spaces.
- 3.4 Four categories have emerged which would appear to offer a solution while trying to accommodate local factors. These are:
- 3.5 **Category 1.** Introduction of 2-3 hour duration payable disc/permit at £12 per annum (£1 per month). We know from the surveys that the majority of all visits to car parks are local frequent shoppers - in most cases 90% of those parking. Certain car parks should to be limited to 2 hours maximum to ensure frequent customer churn e.g. Mill Lane Storrington, or 1 hour maximum - High Street, Steyning. It is proposed that permits would be transferable between vehicles (i.e. not linked to a specific car registration number). Additional permits (maximum four) per address could be purchased at a substantial discount from the normal permit price (£6 is suggested) to offer convenience to residents with more than one vehicle. This system is likely to apply to Billingshurst, Henfield, Pulborough, Steyning, Storrington, Cowfold and Godwin Way (North Horsham Parish). For Category 1 to be effective and provide value for money, standardisation and convenience for our residents, it is important that the permit is valid in as many of the Councils rural car parks as possible. To create too many options with parish preference to opt out will continue to deliver a complicated scheme.

- 3.6 **Category 2.** Community lease option primarily for village hall/ open space access at a peppercorn rent or purchase of land with the local Parish Council. In some cases, business rates for the car parks are incorporated into the parish building or in close proximity. E.g. Partridge Green, Warnham, Rudgwick.
- 3.7 **Category 3.** Annual season tickets for business use are based on attempting to recover the business rate for the parking space plus an allowance for provision costs. The allocation and location to be revisited with local Parish Councils to ensure long stay season ticket holders do not occupy prime spaces where demand is greatest for short stay parking. Season ticket numbers will be limited and criteria regarding local employment will need to be met. It is suggested that these are provided in the following market towns:

Parish (space allocation)	Current charge	Proposed All day parking at £2.50 per week (50p per day)
Billingshurst	£126	£130 pa
Henfield	£0	£130 pa
Pulborough	£21	£130 pa
Steyning	£0	£130 pa
Storrington	£53	£130 pa

- 3.8 **Category 4.** Visitors/ ad hoc users (non-disc/permit holders): In the main car parks - installation of Pay & Display machines (credit/debit cards only linked by landline telephone) where visitors can be directed to pay. (Billingshurst, Henfield, Pulborough, Steyning, Storrington, Godwin Way). It is proposed that we will charge 1 hour parking at £0.75, up to 3 hours parking (or maximum to be agreed) for £1.50.

We are proposing 3 hours parking at £1.50 (or up to the maximum permitted parking time to be discussed with Parish Councils) to increase dwell time. Additionally, the cost associated with card merchanting fee transactions would not be financially viable if tickets were sold at a lower price. Cash collection from machines is expensive and there is a greater risk of vandalism so to minimise the operational costs, credit/debit card transactions are proposed.

- 3.9 How these categories are applied across our car parks can be seen detailed in Appendix 1. This list provided clarity for each of the Parish areas as to the parking regimes and applicable times that arrangements will apply.

4 Next Steps

- 4.1 It is necessary for West Sussex County Council through its County Local Committees (CLC) (Chanctonbury CLC - 23rd November 2016 and Horsham CLC - 28th November 2016), to approve proposals for the principle of charging in car parks where current charges do not apply (i.e. where it is currently not necessary to purchase a parking disc). Primarily this includes Steyning, Henfield, Cowfold, Upper Beeding, Bramber, North Horsham (Godwin Way) car parks. With regard to Cowfold, HDC is not able to lease this car park to the Parish Council due to land

ownership issues. In addition Southwater (Lintot Square) car park is excluded from these proposals as lease agreements with the local retail tenants require free car parking to be provided and the costs of running the car park is already met by tenants of the local shops.

- 4.2 As the Highways Authority, WSCC need to approve whether the District Council is able to introduce car parking charges (whether an annual permit, Pay & Display and Season tickets) to those car parks not currently covered by existing Orders.
- 4.3 Once WSCC County Local Committees approve these proposals then a 21-day notice period is required before new arrangement can take effect. It is proposed that new rural car parking arrangements will take effect from Monday 3rd April 2017.
- 4.4 After the expiry of the 21-day notice period, a project plan will be developed outlining the key steps necessary to implement the decisions. These are:
- To procure new pay & display machines,
 - Develop a marketing campaign to promote the take up of annual permits,
 - Identify season ticket capacity with Parishes in appropriate car parks.
 - Confirm (where appropriate) reasonable maximum stay periods for each car park with Parishes.
 - New simplified signage will be installed in the car parks.
 - Development of on-line applications for annual discs/ permits.

5 Views of the Local Economy Policy Development Advisory Group and Outcome of Consultations

- 5.1 A number of discussions have taken place with the Local Economy Policy Development Advisory Group (PDAG) and an 'All Member' seminar was held in April 2016, which outlined some of the emerging options. Members of the PDAG have been kept involved and up to date of this review as it has been on-going. At the last PDAG meeting on the 5th October 2016, all members supported the proposals as outlined in the recommendations in this report.

Meetings with Parish Councils

- 5.2 In June 2016, the Director of Community Services wrote to all Parish Councils and WSCC local councillors, informing them of our rural car parking review and what the key objectives of the review were.

In addition, during September, the Cabinet Member, Director of Community Services, Parking Services Manager and relevant local HDC ward Members attended numerous meetings held with local Parish Council representatives and the relevant WSCC local Councillor. These included meetings with the following parishes:

Billingshurst	West Grinstead (Partridge Green)	Steyning
Bramber	Southwater	North Horsham
Pulborough	Cowfold	Upper Beeding
Storrington	Henfield	Warnham

- 5.3 At each meeting with Parish Councils the current cost breakdown of providing local car parking in their areas was discussed. This included all budgeted costs for reactive engineering works, business rates, utility costs, number of parking spaces, central and departmental charges and income received from the car parks. The cost for parking enforcement of £40k pa was provided as a separate cost as it was noted that this amount includes an element of on-street enforcement and it is difficult to arrive at a separate figure. Other investment costs, such as general on-going maintenance (resurfacing/white lines/ drainage clearing) or any likely need for future extension or further increases in capacity were not included in the cost breakdown provided.
- 5.4 A detailed analysis of the survey results – which highlighted reasons for using the car parks, place of journey origin, frequency and purpose of visit was discussed with each of the Parish Councils. These results were discussed to agree the pattern of usage and whether any anomalies in the data existed. E.g. Storrington Mill Lane-occupancy, where it was agreed that the survey figures did not present the ‘norm’ on the days of the survey.

It was noted in some villages that there are existing charges made for Season ticket (business use) and also some license agreements from historical arrangements/tenancies.

- 5.5 The main areas discussed with Parishes included:
- A proposal for HDC to introduce an annual fee payable permit/disc at a figure of £10-20 (85p to £1.65 per month) which would allow short term (to the permitted maximum time parking) in HDC rural car parks i.e. not including Horsham Town centre. The disc system, where in use, was generally considered the most user-friendly method. Some views favoured a Pay & Display system but this did not offer convenience for the dominant users of the car park who frequented them 2-3 times a week.
 - A solution that would support the vibrancy of the local high street and support local retailers by creating a regular churn of vehicle movements and consequently footfall. In particular, whether a simple solution could be put in place to allow for day visitors to our market towns as the current arrangements particularly through the use for visitor discs, were inconsistent, unhelpful and outdated.
 - An offer for Parishes to lease local car parks from HDC at a peppercorn rent, with each parish council taking full responsibility for covering all associated costs. These costs could be covered through the parish precept. (With the level of enforcement to be negotiated with HDC at a later date). In some cases larger maintenance costs would be required in these car parks in the medium term (the Council has spent an average of £34,000 pa on major repairs in rural car parks in the past 10 years). Parishes would need to plan for these costs and undertake required works and investment when required.
 - Availability of appropriately priced season tickets for business users to provide them with all day parking (as far as possible reflecting the true cost to provide, demand and local capacity). There is a need to try to locate such provision so

that it does not take up places that would otherwise be used by potential customers of the businesses. These season tickets currently exist in certain car parks and range from £21 to £126 per annum depending on the location.

- Visitors/ ad-hoc users. A charge to park for a period up to the permitted wait limit. This could be provided by:
 - a) the use of scratch cards as per Worthing/Chichester/CPZ on street arrangements - up to 3 hours.
 - b) Books of tickets sold at a discount to retailers.
 - c) Pay by phone where the mobile signal is good.
 - d) In very busy rural car parks consideration of the installation of Pay & Display machines (credit/debit cards) per town where visitors can be directed. (Billingshurst, Henfield, Pulborough, Steyning, Storrington, Godwin Way - N. Horsham).

- 5.6 All Parishes were asked to consider our proposals formally and advise the Council of their views. The following Parish Councils have responded confirming that they have no wish to take responsibility for our car parks: - Pulborough, Storrington, Henfield, Bramber, Billingshurst, North Horsham. Warnham and Partridge Green have indicated that they wish to take responsibility for lease/purchase. Steyning Parish Council is opposed to any of our suggestions and were not able to come to a view within our timescales.
- 5.7 Follow-up meetings have been held with local HDC ward members to discuss the likely proposals for their areas. In addition Parishes have been written to, informing them of our proposals and an outline of the recommendations made at this meeting.
- 5.8 On the 20th October, the Cabinet member, Director of Community Services, Parking Service Manager and Rural Economic Development Officer met with representatives of the Rural Towns Forum. This consisted primarily of Community Partnerships. At this meeting draft proposals and the rationale of each emerging category for addressing rural car parking provision was discussed. The issue of the rural economies dominated this discussion, but outlining the proposals demonstrated that the proposals actually supported local retailers by ensuring regular churn of customers, ease of use and much simpler arrangements for visitors to their areas. It was also proposed by representatives of the Rural Towns Forum whether in the marketing of the annual permits, if it was possible to design a brochure/leaflet which promoted what the market towns had to offer and which could be included with the permits when they were dispatched. This was considered to be an effective way in which to promote all the market towns in the district, encourage users to visit other areas and support local economies.
- 5.9 Comments from the Monitoring Officer and the Director of Corporate Resources have been incorporated in to this report.
- 5.10 Discussions have taken place with the Regional WSCC Highways Manager on these proposals.

6 Other Courses of Action Considered but Rejected

- 6.1 Many other rural areas throughout the country have introduced Pay and Display machines and charge by the hour. This is a standard car park operating method that offers a number of benefits such as simplicity to use, but also penalises and deters loyal users and doesn't support dwell times for shoppers.
- 6.2 This option was considered but due to points made in 6.1, it was decided that the pay and display machines/facilities would be an option within a larger scheme.

7 Resource Consequences -Current cost of providing parking

- 7.1 The cost of providing HDC's rural car parks 2015/16 including the current level of enforcement (but excluding long term works and maintenance) was £236,000
- 7.2 Additionally, the Council needs to include an annual sinking fund to pay for future projected maintenance and major repairs. An annual sinking fund of £50,500 would cover future works based on a recent condition survey of our rural car parks. However this sum excludes any major improvements, expansion or car park re-configuration works.
- 7.3 We have calculated that the Council should be seeking to recover approximately £315,150 (£286,500 plus £28,650 (10%) contingency/inflation costs/administration costs) per annum if the rural car parks are to be totally cost neutral to HDC. There is also some initial revenue set up and investment costs for equipment and administration which can be incorporated in to the costs as detailed in section 7.12.
- 7.4 While some communities have sufficient parking capacity, in other areas there are very high (95%) occupancy rates highlighting considerable pressure on the current level of provision. Where local growth is planned this is likely to exacerbate the issue. Some areas may require expansion or possibly further site acquisition to support retail businesses and local infrastructure. We should endeavour to seek any extra investment required through developers where appropriate but it will also likely require additional investment by HDC.
- 7.5 Rural car parks over the years have had very limited investment in structure, appearance and signage. These car parks can be the first and last thing a customer sees when they visit our district and does not reflect the quality of experience on offer. We would like to introduce an investment programme to bring the car parks up to a level that better reflects the Horsham District.
- 7.6 Car parking availability is very important to enable economic growth and stability as well as ensuring free flow of traffic, increased road safety and reduced pollution. It is important that appropriate levels of parking are made available.

Both of these areas of work need investment which is difficult to guarantee without an income flow or business case to support investment.

7.7 Potential Income

The number of households in the district is 57,791 (2016 WSCC estimate) of which 31,096 are in Horsham town and its immediate hinterland (including North Horsham Parish, Broadbridge Heath, Southwater and the northern parish areas).

The number of households outside Horsham town is circa 26,000 rural households, of which the majority are likely to need the use of one of HDC's rural car parks. Car ownership and the number of households with more than one vehicle is very high. There will also be visits from users residing outside the Horsham District area. Table 1 below outlines the projected income from the sale of annual permits.

Table 1 Income participation vs. cost of annual permit- cost neutral is approximately £315k pa

26,000 rural households	At £20 per annual permit forecast income	At £15 per annual permit forecast income	At £12 per annual permit forecast income (£1 per month)
Estimated number of take up assuming 80% participation of rural households = 20,800	£416k	£312k	£249k
Estimated number of take up assuming 75% participation of rural households = 19,500	£390k	£295.5k	£234k
Estimated number of take up assuming 70% participation of rural households = 18,200	£364k	£273k	£218k
Estimated number of take up assuming 60% participation of rural households = 15,600	£312k	£234k	£187k
Estimated number of take up assuming 50% participation or rural households = 13,000	£260k	£195k	£156k

7.8 It is clearly difficult to know the take-up level of discs/permits or the actual percentage of existing car park users per community. However, following discussions with Parish Councils, it was clear that a relatively low charge was not generally considered to have a greatly inhibiting effect on car park use. For the purpose of this proposal, it is assumed that take up of the annual discs/permits would be 75% of the 26,000 rural households. At £12 per permit this would generate £234k pa. If 35% (6825) of these households were to purchase a second permit at £6 (half price of the first permit) this would generate an additional £40,950 pa. In total £274,950 would be generated through annual discs/permits to offset the costs of providing rural car parking.

7.9 Visitors/non-permit/ ad hoc tickets: If there is good take up of the annual permit, it is assumed that use by ad hoc users and income generated from Pay & Display machines would only form a small % of total users. Based on an estimate of current visitor numbers (extrapolated from the surveys undertaken in July 2016) charging £0.75p per hour x 2500 visits pa = £1875 pa. In addition, Pay & Display users purchasing a ticket between 2-3 hours x 2500 visits = £3750 pa. The total income that would be derived from Pay & Display facilities to offset the cost of providing rural car parking is £5,625 pa.

7.10 Season ticket - an allocation of season tickets needs to be provided in the main market towns. It is calculated that between 25-33% of total spaces should be assigned for long stay places (parking industry calculation); although this is likely to be lower in a number of the large market towns. Calculations are based on the following: Billingshurst (38 long term season tickets), Pulborough (26 long term season tickets), Steyning (66 long term season tickets), Storrington (85 long term season tickets) and Henfield (61 long term season tickets) =276 tickets @ £130pa= £35,880.

7.11 Costs recovered at suggested take-up figures:

from the sale of Annual Permits	= £274,950
from the sale of Pay & display Tickets	= £5,625
from the sale of Season Tickets	= £35,880

TOTAL = £316,455

7.12 **Project costs**

To implement and run the scheme there will be a capital cost for implementation and an additional annual cost for administering the scheme. The costs are broken down below (Table 2.) and equate to £29k per year if the capital and one-off costs are spread over a 10yr period. Year 1 includes a one-off £10k marketing promotional budget. Future revenue costs will be built into the 2017/18 revenue budget. Any up front revenue costs that occur in 2016/17 will be absorbed into existing 2016/17 parking budgets.

Table 2- Indicative project costs

	Unit cost	£	Notes
Capital Costs:			
Machines	4,000	44,000	11 machines
Signage		15,000	
Phone line installation	3,000	33,000	11 installs. Alternatives being explored
Total		92,000	
Annual Revenue costs:			
Annual Permits	£2,204 per 5,000	11,020	25,000 ordered
Season tickets	£568 per 500	340	at 300 sold
Enforcement		3,000	Based on £150 a day x 20 additional days
P&D tickets tickets	250,000 = £1,096	275	Based on 62,000 -
Phone line	100	1,100	11 machines
Parkeon online folder	10	110	11 machines
Staff admin		3,000	Based on £100 a day - 30 days
Total		18,845	
One-off revenue cost			
Marketing /promotion costs		10,000	First year only.

7.13 The up front capital costs will be funded from the existing 2016/17 capital programme from unspent budgets no longer needed in 2016/17. A virement of £77k from existing corporate capital budgets that will not be spent this year will be made into a new rural car parking capital project code to pay for the 11 car parking machines and phone line installations. A sufficient capital budget for changing car park signage is already in place as changes to car parking signage was already planned for 2016/17. Up front capital expenditure in 2016/17 on the project will enable the scheme to have the infrastructure in place to go live on 3 April 2017.

7.14 **On-line payment discount.** In an attempt to make the administration of rural car parking as efficient as possible and reduce the cost burden placed on the Council, it is proposed that an additional charge is made of £2.50 for transactions which are not undertaken through our Horsham District Council website or via Direct Debit arrangements. Rural parking fee transactions administered via the Councils Contact Centre will be charged an additional £2.50 and this will be made clear to customers. The processing cost of transactions through the contact centre is estimated to be £2.83 per transaction, £5.95-£6.62 (Google) for postal transactions compared to a web transaction rate of 15 pence. The council introduced similar arrangement with its Garden Waste Scheme in 2016/17 which has resulted in only 6% of transactions now being received via this route.

8 Legal Consequences

8.1 Change to Parking order – County Local Committee approval required. For consideration on the 23/11/2016- Chanctonbury CLC and 28/11/2016 Horsham CLC

8.2 Traffic Management Act 2004

9 Risk Assessment

9.1 As with any new parking regime being introduced there is a concern that it may cause displacement of cars onto surrounding residential roads. We are offering a scheme that reduces the likely impact of that. During the last year HDC has introduced Sunday parking charges within the town centre and charges at the Southwater Country Park. Both of these decisions were made with a number of representations against the charges because of the concern of displacement. Since these two schemes have been live neither Parking Services nor WSCC Highways have received any complaints regarding displacement due to the introduction of charges. At SCP it has been the lack of capacity and heavy summer holiday demand that resulted in a number of cars using residential roads, not the introduction of a parking charge

9.2 Administration of the scheme- An element of officer time is already assigned to this but temporary staff may be needed to administer the scheme. (Feb/March/April).

9.3 Any decision Cabinet make will be dependent on WSCC CLC making a decision to pass down the powers to allow HDC to charge within certain car park. Without these powers, we will not be able to progress with the scheme, other than in areas where charging is already permitted.

9.4 All income predictions are made from the best information we have available but in reality, we will not know the true income potential until we launch the scheme

9.5 If there is a lower take up of the annual disc/permit this would imply a proportionately higher purchase of Pay and Display tickets would take place to balance this. However, Pay and Display might also prove helpful in the changeover period for those who have not yet purchased a disc/permit and for those who establish that a disc/permit in the longer term is better value or more convenient.

9.6 As with any new scheme once implemented, there will be a degree of trying to find the best solution but having the willingness and flexibility to adjust it once it has been in operation. A review of the scheme is proposed 12 months after implementation.

10 Other Considerations

Impact On-Street / displacement

10.1 Proposals contained in this report provide a number of benefits to support cars not being displaced on to the highway. These include:

- 10.2 A clear, simple and cheap annual parking disc/permit at £12 pa (£1 a month) - which provides unlimited use across our rural areas. This is extremely affordable and should not displace vehicles on to the highway. More than 90% of users of our rural car parks are those who frequent them 1-3 times a week. The majority will purchase an annual permit and will want value for money and convenience from them and thus choose to park in our car parks, not on adjacent roads.
- 10.3 The proposals outlined in this report create a parking regime which addresses long occupancy times in our car parks e.g. In Steyning two of the main car parks allow for 24-hour car parking. The current system encourages many spaces to be used once and parked in all day- this causes the car parks to be full with overspill cars having no choice but to use the highway. There is little parking churn as a consequence. Car parks at near capacity/ full discourage customers to enter them in the first place to try and find a space. The current system creates displacement.
- 10.4 We are proposing a well thought out long stay parking arrangements for workers/business use which makes adequate provision for those requiring long stay use. Although this will be charged at £130 per annum (50p per day/£2.50 per week) the majority of users want certainty and convenience, rather than using adjacent streets and unpredictable walking times to their destination.
- 10.5 The current system is very confusing for visitors and ad hoc users of our market towns. Feedback from retailers has indicated that there is significant confusion when visitors/ad hoc users visit our market towns and understanding what arrangements for parking are in place. In areas where there is currently no charge e.g. Steyning, parking discs are required which are very difficult to obtain from local outlets. Very often when cars arrive they do not understand the system or can't find an outlet for the discs and therefore in order to avoid a PCN the preference is to park on the highway.
- 10.6 We are proposing to install Pay & Display machines for (1 hour and up to 3 hours) in our main market towns which for visitors/ad hoc users provides a simple familiar mechanism which all drivers are used to. This simplicity will encourage the use of our car parks discouraging the displacement on to local streets.
- 10.7 The installation of pay and display machines which accept debit and credit cards will address the issue of customers not having change or the right change.
- 10.8 A district wide rural disc/permit – needs adopting across all the market towns to avoid the current confusion created by several different local schemes. In some places, you need to pay, some you need a disc, some places you need nothing. This lack of consistency for our residents who move between villages and market towns causes confusion. To avoid uncertainty is to park on the street.
- 10.9 We consider that these proposals for regular users, visitors and long stay parkers are clear, simple and encourage our designated car parks to be used properly therefore discouraging displacement onto the highway.
- 10.10 Existing disabled parking arrangements will be applied to rural car parks. Currently residents in receipt of Higher Rate Living Allowance are exempt from paying for parking but must use allocated disabled parking bays. An Equalities Impact Assessment is attached as Appendix 2.

Appendix 1

Draft Rural Car Park Proposal - Horsham District Council - November 2016

		Current Scheme			Proposed Scheme April 2017		
Location	Car park	Operation	Max stay time	Season tickets	Operation - Mon - Sat 9 am - 6pm (unless otherwise stated)	Max stay time	Season tickets
Billingshurst	Library	50p Disc - 2 hours parking with disc. Additional time for up to 5 hours can be purchased at 50p an hour using scratch cards available from local shops. Season tickets available at £126 per year	5hrs	£126	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130
	Six Bells	50p Disc - 2 hours parking with disc. Additional time for up to 5 hours can be purchased at 50p an hour using scratch cards available from local shops. Season tickets available at £126 per year	5hrs	£126	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130
	Jengers Mead	Season Ticket Only	24hrs	£126	Season Ticket Only	24hrs	£130
Bramber	The Street	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs (excl Saturdays)	£130
Cowfold	Playfield	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs (excl Saturdays)	£130
Henfield	Library	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130
	Coopers Way	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130
Partridge Green	Little Oak	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24hrs	N/A	Parish responsibility through lease arrangements.	N/A	N/A
Pulborough	Lower Street	50p Disc - allows up to 4 hrs parking - season tickets available at £21 per year	4 hrs	£21	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park. 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3 hrs or maximum stay. 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	4hrs	£130
Rudgwick	Foxholes, High St	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24 hrs	N/A	Current arrangements will apply.	N/A	N/A

Southwater	Lintot Square	No disc - 2 hours free parking - no season tickets	2 hrs	N/A	Current arrangements will apply due to lease arrangements.	2 hrs	N/A
Steyning	High Street	Free disc - allows up to 2 hrs parking - No season tickets	2hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, . No season ticket parkers	1hr	N/A
	Fletchers Croft	Completely free with no time restrictions - No season tickets	24hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130
	Newmans Gardens	Free disc - allows up to 4 hrs parking. Additionally there is a completely free 24hr section of the car park with no time restriction. No season tickets.	4hr and 24hr	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130
Storrington	Mill Lane	50p Disc - 2 hours parking with disc. Additional time for up to 5 hours can be purchased at 50p an hour using scratch cards available from local shops. No season tickets available	5hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 2hrs . No season ticket parkers	2hrs	N/A
	North Street	50p Disc - 2 hours parking with disc. Additional time for up to 5 hours can be purchased at 50p an hour using scratch cards available from local shops. Season tickets available at £52.50 per year	5hrs	£52.50	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130
	Hanover Walk	50p Disc - 2 hours parking with disc. Additional time for up to 5 hours can be purchased at 50p an hour using scratch cards available from local shops. Season tickets available at £52.50 per year	5hrs	£52.50	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130
Upper Beeding	High Street	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs or maximum stay. 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	4hrs (excl Saturdays)	£130
Warnham	Village Hall	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24hrs	N/A	Parish responsibility through lease arrangements.	N/A	N/A
Roffey	Godwin Way	Completely free with no time restrictions - no season tickets	24hrs	N/A	1. £12 annual permit for frequent short stay parkers. Max stay is limit of car park 2. Pay and display for short stay infrequent parkers - 75p for 1hr, £1.50 for 3hrs 3. Season ticket for all day parkers at £130 per year.	3hrs	£130

APPENDIX 2

Equality Impact Assessment (Horsham District Council) – Policy/Procedure/Strategy/Function template

Please fill in as many of the boxes as possible (on Microsoft Word or preferred format if you have a disability which means you cannot use Word) and be aware that written information/evidence may be asked for, to back your comments. If you need further assistance or training on filling this template, please contact the Equalities Officer on 01403 215574 damian.brewer@horsham.gov.uk

Names of Team members (min of 2 – Author, manager and or staff member/equality lead) and Lead Officer/Director	Ben Golds – Parking Services manager Natalie Brahma Pearl – Director of Community Services
Consultation mechanism (names of equality groups liaised with) i.e. Access Forum, Staff Group	Parish Councils : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steyning - Storrington - Billingshurst - Bramber - Cowfold - Henfield - Partridge Green - Pulborough - Southwater - Upper Beeding - Warnham - North Horsham Community Partnership – Action in Rural Sussex District Councillors WSCC Councillors
Date Equality Impact Assessment submitted to ratifying committee	Cabinet 24 th November 2016
Are there resource implications to deliver actions from this EIA? If yes, please detail	No
Name of policy/strategy	Rural Car Parking Arrangements

Aim of policy/strategy (maximum 100 words)	<p>There are three aims to the delivery of this policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to the pressures placed on the District Councils finances there are a number of service areas being reviewed. The rural car parks cost us over £286k a year to run. We are aiming to make this cost neutral. 2. Currently there are a number of different parking operations in place across all of our rural areas. These are confusing for the customer and are very difficult to manage and enforce. We are aiming to bring some consistency and simplicity for the car park users across all of rural car parks. 3. Over the years large amounts of money have been spent on responsive maintenance but there has been no finances set aside for improvement works to the look, feel and function of the car parks – this includes improved signage, access and increased abby numbers.
--	--

Impact Assessment

Page 174

<p>Does the policy/strategy target or exclude a particular equality groups listed?</p> <p>(Consider Direct Discrimination)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Race</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Disability/carer</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Gender/gender identity</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Age</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Sexual orientation</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Religion & Belief</td><td>No</td></tr> </table>	Race	No	Disability/carer	No	Gender/gender identity	No	Age	No	Sexual orientation	No	Religion & Belief	No	<p>The main purpose of the proposal is to introduce charging and improve the process and customer experience.</p> <p>Improvements to the way the car parks operate will benefit all users and does not target any particular groups.</p>
Race	No													
Disability/carer	No													
Gender/gender identity	No													
Age	No													
Sexual orientation	No													
Religion & Belief	No													
<p>Does the policy/strategy affect any of the equality groups listed disproportionately?</p> <p>(Consider Indirect Discrimination)</p> <p>(List all negative and positive impacts)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Race</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Disability/carer</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Gender/gender identity</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Age</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Sexual orientation</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Religion & Belief</td><td>No</td></tr> </table>	Race	Yes	Disability/carer	Yes	Gender/gender identity	No	Age	Yes	Sexual orientation	No	Religion & Belief	No	<p>Race – English not first language</p> <p>Disability - Machines need appropriate lighting and must be at an accessible height; need to work for wheel chair users. Additionally the location of the machine needs to be considered. Positive – Discs will not be vehicle specific so can be used by carers. Simple pay process.</p> <p>Gender – being pregnant could make shopping tasks take longer.</p> <p>Age – Positive – improved consistency is better for those that use</p>
Race	Yes													
Disability/carer	Yes													
Gender/gender identity	No													
Age	Yes													
Sexual orientation	No													
Religion & Belief	No													

the car parks and may suffer from dementia. There could be slower mobility though; additionally and elderly person may be more likely to stay local.

What evidence has been used to make these judgements? Please tick one or more	Demographic data and other statistics, including census findings	Yes	Usage surveys
	Information from groups/agencies/consultation/research within Horsham District	Yes	
	Comparisons between similar functions / policies either internally or with other District Councils	Yes	
	Analysis of complaints/public enquiries information/audits or reviews		

How is the effect of the policy/strategy on different equality groups going to be monitored? Please specify for each equality group	Race	Yes	For all groups affected it is important that a full communication plan is in place to enable two way communications. There will be a review of changes in 1 year since implementation. We shall also be reviewing the number of accessible parking bays ensuring that there is enough.
	Disability/carer	Yes	
	Gender/gender identity	Yes	
	Age	Yes	
	Sexual orientation	N/A	
	Religion & Belief	N/A	

Page 175

Does the document have an access statement offering the document in alternative formats for disabled people? Yes If no, please add to action plan as evidence that this assessment has assisted.	Do staff dealing with this document know where to get alternative formats if a request is made? Yes If no, please add awareness training needed to action plan (Equalities Officer can provide)	Does the document need to be translated into key locally used languages? No If yes, how will this be distributed and funded?
--	---	--

Action Plan (to reduce or eliminate any adverse impacts)

Equality Strand	Action and Resources	Lead Person	Timescale
Age – need to stay local	The scheme is aimed at promoting and keeping local people local. The £12 disc is considered to be a cost effective option for local people to park and use local amenities	Ben Golds	November 2016
Race – English not first language Visually impaired	Pictorial signs and on website to help those do not have English as a first language. Good contrast of colours on signage	Stuart Slater/ Charlotte Burnside	February 2017
Race – English not first language	Purchase machines that can communicate in various languages	Stuart Slater	February 2017
Disability /Carer – location of pay machines	Number of spaces available on the website along with location of accessible bays	Charlotte Burnside	March 2017
Disability/ Carer	Machines will be positioned and be disabled accredited to ensure they meet the needs of all users.	Stuart Slater	February 2017

Please send draft version to Equalities Officer at Horsham District Council 01403 215574 or Damian.brewer@horsham.gov.uk, once a version of this assessment has been approved, it will be uploaded onto the website for public scrutiny/viewing and actions will be added to a spreadsheet/calendar for monitoring.

**Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham,
West Sussex RH12 1RL**

FORWARD PLAN

This notice sets out details of key decisions that the Cabinet or a Cabinet Member intend to make, and gives 28 days' notice of the decision under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012. The notice also includes details of other decisions the Council intends to make.

The reports and any background documents that have been used to inform the decisions will be available on the Council's website (www.horsham.gov.uk) or by contacting Committee Services at the Council Offices.

Whilst the majority of the Council's business will be open to the public, there will be occasions when the business to be considered contains confidential, commercially sensitive or personal information. This is formal notice under the 2012 Regulations that part or all of the reports on the decisions referred to in the schedule may be private because they contain exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

If you wish to make representations about why part or all of the papers should be open to the public, please contact Committee Services at least 10 working days before the date on which the decision is to be taken.

If you wish to make representations to the Cabinet or Cabinet Member about the proposed decisions, please contact Committee Services to make your request.

Please note that the decision date given in this notice may be subject to change.

To contact Committee Services:

E-mail: : committeeservices@horsham.gov.uk

Tel: 01403 215123

Published on 01 November 2016

Page 178 **What is a Key Decision?**

A key decision is an executive decision which, is likely –

(i) to result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or

(ii) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the District.

	Subject/Decision	Decision Taker	Date(s) of decision	Is all or part of this item likely to be dealt with in private	Contact Officer Cabinet Member (NB include name, title and email address)
1.	Medium Term Financial Strategy Policy Development Advisory Group 25 October 2016 Member Seminar 10 November 2016	Cabinet Council	24 Nov 2016 7 Dec 2016	Open	Jane Eaton, Director of Corporate Resources jane.eaton@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets (Councillor Brian Donnelly)
2	Waste and Recycling Collection Review Policy Development Advisory Group 29 September 2016 Policy Development Advisory Group 3 November 2016	Cabinet	24 Nov 2016	Open	Natalie Brahma-Pearl, Director of Community Services natalie.brahma-pearl@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing (Councillor Roy Cornell)
3.	Rural Car Parking arrangements Policy Development Advisory Group 5 October 2016	Cabinet	24 Nov 2016	Open	Natalie Brahma-Pearl, Director of Community Services natalie.brahma-pearl@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Local Economy (Councillor Gordon Lindsay)

	Subject/Decision	Decision Taker	Date(s) of decision	Is all or part of this item likely to be dealt with in private	Contact Officer Cabinet Member (NB include name, title and email address)
4.	Green Waste Charge Policy Development Advisory Group 3 November 2016	Cabinet	24 Nov 2016	Open	Natalie Brahma-Pearl, Director of Community Services natalie.brahma-pearl@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing (Councillor Roy Cornell)
5.	Revised Constitution - Report of the Constitution Review Group	Council	7 Dec 2016	Open	Paul Cummins, Head of Legal & Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) paul.cummins@horsham.gov.uk Leader (Councillor Ray Dawe)
6.	Response of the Council to the Local Government Boundary Commission Consultation on Warding Arrangements	Council	7 Dec 2016	Open	Paul Cummins, Head of Legal & Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) paul.cummins@horsham.gov.uk
7.	Appointment of External Auditors - invitation from Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited for Horsham DC to become an opted in authority for the purposes of appointing external auditors	Council	7 Dec 2016	Open	Jane Eaton, Director of Corporate Resources jane.eaton@horsham.gov.uk

	Subject/Decision	Decision Taker	Date(s) of decision	Is all or part of this item likely to be dealt with in private	Contact Officer Cabinet Member (NB include name, title and email address)
8.	Appointment of Contractor for the redevelopment of Broadbridge Heath leisure centre Policy Development Advisory Group 10 November 2016	Cabinet	15 Dec 2016	Part exempt	Brian Elliott, Property & Facilities Manager brian.elliott@horsham.gov.uk Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture (Councillor Jonathan Chown)
9.	Upgrade of Windows 7 to Windows 10 Policy Development Advisory Group 19 December 2016	Cabinet	26 Jan 2017	Part exempt	Jane Eaton, Director of Corporate Resources jane.eaton@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets (Councillor Brian Donnelly)
10.	Creation of a company for the development of temporary housing Policy Development Advisory Group 19 December 2016	Cabinet Council	26 Jan 2017 15 Feb 2017	Open	Brian Elliott, Property & Facilities Manager brian.elliott@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets (Councillor Brian Donnelly)

	Subject/Decision	Decision Taker	Date(s) of decision	Is all or part of this item likely to be dealt with in private	Contact Officer Cabinet Member (NB include name, title and email address)
11.	Allocation of a Budget for Purchase of Investment Property Policy Development Advisory Group 19 December 2016	Cabinet Council	26 Jan 2017 15 Feb 2017	Open	Brian Elliott, Property & Facilities Manager brian.elliott@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets (Councillor Brian Donnelly)
Page 182	Horsham Town Centre Vision Policy Development Advisory Group 12 January 2017	Cabinet Council	26 Jan 2017 15 Feb 2017	Open	Barbara Childs, Head of Strategic Planning and Sustainability barbara.childs@horsham.gov.uk Leader (Councillor Ray Dawe)
13.	Economic Development Strategy Policy Development Advisory Group 5 October 2016	Cabinet	26 Jan 2017	Open	Clare Mangan, Economic Development Manager clare.mangan@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Local Economy (Councillor Gordon Lindsay)

	Subject/Decision	Decision Taker	Date(s) of decision	Is all or part of this item likely to be dealt with in private	Contact Officer Cabinet Member (NB include name, title and email address)
14.	<p>Housing Strategy interim statement - a response to the July 2015 budget and the Housing and Planning Act 2016</p> <p>Policy Development Advisory Group 23 January 2017</p>	Cabinet	26 Jan 2017	Open	<p>Natalie Brahma-Pearl, Director of Community Services natalie.brahma-pearl@horsham.gov.uk</p> <p>Cabinet Member for Housing and Public Protection (Councillor Philip Circus)</p>
15.	<p>Review and update the Contaminated Land Strategy</p> <p>Policy Development Advisory Group 7 November 2016</p>	Cabinet	26 Jan 2017	Open	<p>John Batchelor, Environmental Health & Licensing Manager john.batchelor@horsham.gov.uk</p> <p>Cabinet Member for Housing and Public Protection (Councillor Philip Circus)</p>
16.	<p>Consideration of business case for shared building control service with Crawley, Arun and Chichester councils</p> <p>Policy Development Advisory Group 12 January 2017</p>	Cabinet	26 Jan 2017	Open	<p>Steve Shorrocks, Building Control Manager stephen.shorrocks@horsham.gov.uk</p> <p>Cabinet Member for Planning and Development (Councillor Claire Vickers)</p>

	Subject/Decision	Decision Taker	Date(s) of decision	Is all or part of this item likely to be dealt with in private	Contact Officer Cabinet Member (NB include name, title and email address)
17.	Consideration of full business cases for shared services (Human Resources, Legal and Audit) Policy Development Advisory Group 19 December 2016	Cabinet	26 Jan 2017	Open	Jane Eaton, Director of Corporate Resources jane.eaton@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets (Councillor Brian Donnelly)
18.	Budget 2017/18	Cabinet Council	26 Jan 2017 15 Feb 2017	Open	Jane Eaton, Director of Corporate Resources jane.eaton@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets (Councillor Brian Donnelly)
19.	Draft Site Allocations Document Policy Development Advisory Group 12 January 2017	Cabinet Council	30 Mar 2017 26 Apr 2017	Open	Barbara Childs, Head of Strategic Planning and Sustainability barbara.childs@horsham.gov.uk Cabinet Member for Planning and Development (Councillor Claire Vickers)