

## Appendix A Detailed Proposals

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Richard Cassidy	Chief Executive	CED1	Senior Management restructure		-30	-65	-65	Management restructure
Richard Cassidy	Chief Executive	CED2	Corporate Support Team		-5	-10	-10	Review of Corporate Support team

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	CM001	Policy		-25	-25	-25	Cease Corporate Policy work
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	CM002	Communications	-10	-10	-10	-10	Cease printing Link and make digital only.
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	CM002	Communications					Option 1 reduce communications activity will save £30k per annum
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	CM002	Communications		-90	-90	-90	Option 2 cease communications activity other than reactive to press or crisis Plus increased online payments and diverting cash and cheques to Post
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	CS001	Digital Receptions		-50	-63	-63	Office/Paypoint
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	ED001	Economic Development		-35	-35	-35	Repurpose function to concentrate on Launchpad
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	ED101	Ec Dev Subscriptions		-5	-20	-20	Cease payments at end of agreed funding term for external partnerships
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	ED102	Launchpad		0	0	0	No proposals
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	IN001	Major Projects Team		0	0	0	No proposals as no major projects proposed to be halted
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	RD101	Rural Development Programme		0	0	0	Project ceased and no expenditure on this cost centre
Ben Wood	Communications, Strategy & Policy	RED001	Economic Development		0	0	0	Only expenditure is payment towards Visit Herts

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	BU101	Public Health Burials		0	0	0	
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW001	Community Wellbeing Team		-25	-50	-50	Restructure service
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW101	Resilience Partnership		-26	-26	-26	End partnership and absorb within Health & Housing
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW102	Community Safety		0	0	0	PCSO saving of £44k previously approved
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW103	Community Grants		-84	-84	-84	Option 3 Cease Community Transport grant
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW103	Community Grants					Option 2 Community Transport grant reduction of 50% saving £42k per annum
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW103	Community Grants					Option 1 Community Transport grant reduction saving £6k per annum
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW103	Community Grants		-16	-16	-16	End all sports grants
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW103	Community Grants		-11	-11	-11	Reduce general grants
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW103	Community Grants		0	0	0	£10k reduction approved in last budget. Community Grants to be consolidated together and further consideration given to SLAa to organisations that deliver corporate priorities. Grants to parish councils to cease as they can raise finance via the precept.
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	CW103	Community Grants		0	0	0	Stop providing courses and leave to the market.
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	EH001	Environmental Health		-10	-12	-12	End van leases and use electric pool cars
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	EH101	EH Sampling		0	0	0	Budget reduced in 2017
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	EH104	Air Quality		-2	-4	-6	Reduce air monitoring
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	EH106	Housing		-31	-31	-31	Delete housing survey and delete income target incorrectly in revenue
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	HG001	Housing		0	0	0	Largely Funded by Government grants - any reduction in service on homelessness risks Government clawing money back
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	HG103	Homelessness		0	0	0	
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	HG104	Hillcrest Hostel		0	0	0	
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	LN001	Licensing		0	0	0	
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	LN101	Premises and Gambling Licences		0	0	0	Fees and Charges review to be undertaken
Jonathan Geall	Housing & Health	RLN101	Taxi Licensing		0	0	0	Statutory requirement to break even

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Simon O'Hear	Human Resources	HR1	HR&OD	-10	-24	-34	-37	Various changes
Simon O'Hear	Human Resources	HR2	Apprentices	-40	-53	-73	-73	Delete posts

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS1	Legal Services	31	-7	-27	-63	Staffing restructure
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS2	Civic Regalia		-6			Sell spare chain
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS2	Cease webcasting		-15	-15	-15	As a challenge, how many meetings could we reduce by and thus produce a saving in less officers servicing committees?
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS2	Civic Regalia		-6	0	0	Sell spare chain
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS2	Democratic Services		0	-3	-3	IRP to be convened once every 4 years only
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS3	Land Charges	-60	0	0	0	Bulk order of searches by Housing Association in 2020/21 Service required to breakeven. Service will transfer to Land registry over MTFS period.
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS4	Electoral Registration		-2	-2	-2	Invitation to Register reminders
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS4	Electoral Registration		-25	-25	-25	Annual Canvas reform
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS4	Electoral Registration		-4	-4	-4	Postage
James Ellis	Legal & Democratic	LDS5	Street Naming and Numbering		0	0	0	Electronic application with card payment or BACS? Go Digital only?

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	EN001	Environmental Inspection			31	0	0 Necessary cost pressure
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OP30	Markets			0	0	0 Nil expenditure
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS1	Business Support			-3	-3	-3 Postage
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS1	Business Support		-6	-6	-6	-6 Training
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS11	Leisure			100	100	-404
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS12	Garden Waste charging			-703	-735	-735 Core budget approved January 2020 assumes £400k saving already in budget
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS13	Public conveniences			-18	-18	-18 Close Buntingford and end Community Toilet Scheme
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS20-26	Car Parking				-484	-551 Comprehensive changes to car parking service offer
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS27-29	Hertford Theatre			34	88	-400 Pressure from closure then reopening operating at surplus
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS6	Remove litter and dog waste bins			-70	-95	-95 Remove litter and dog waste bins
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS6	Litter and dog waste bins			-19	-19	-19 Combine litter and dog waste bins
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS6	Parks and Open Spaces			-8	-15	-20 Catering Concessions
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS7	Allotments			-1	-1	-1 Fees and charges
Jess Khanom-Metaman	Operations	OPS8	Playgrounds			-5	-10	-10 Close 6 playgrounds

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Sara Saunders	Planning	PBC2	Building Control			23	23	23 company
Sara Saunders	Planning	PBC3	Pre-App Planning Advice			0	0	0 Pre-App Planning Advice fees review
Sara Saunders	Planning	PBC4	Planning Policy		-40	0	0	0 Grant funding for Neighbourhood Plan referenda
Sara Saunders	Planning	PL001	Planning Services			-41	-41	-41 Archive digitisation
Sara Saunders	Planning	PL001	Planning Services			-30	-30	-30 Online adverts except for some major applications
Sara Saunders	Planning	PL001	Planning Services			-30	-30	-30 Staffing restructure
Sara Saunders	Planning		Historic Building Grants			-10	-20	Phased cessation. Assist with signposting to other historic building grants available?

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Su Tarran	Revenues and Benefits	RB001	Revenues and Benefits Shared Se	-11	-59	-59	-59	Staffing changes
Su Tarran	Revenues and Benefits	RB002	Revenues and Benefits retained c	-83	-83	-83	-83	Various budget adjustments

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SF001	Strategic Finance		-6	-6	-6	Reduction in Shared Internal Audit Service Days
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SF001 - 6	Finance					To be reviewed by the new Head of Strategic Finance & Property after 6 months.
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SF003	Procurement		-5	-5	-5	Delete post Bank charges - we will retender the banking, merchant acquiring for card payments and reduce the number of bank accounts down to 1.
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SF101	Other Expenses		0	0	0	
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SP001	Property & Asset Management		0	0	0	
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SP002	Facilities Management		-33	-33	-33	Post Room and Courier service changes
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SP003	Wallfields		0	0	0	
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SP004	Charringtons		-100	-139	-139	Office transferred to City Heart from june 2021
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SP005	Buntingford		0	0	0	To examine potential for a different site or seek to reduce the lease costs.
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SP006	Rent and Misc		0	0	0	
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SP007	Street Lighting		0	0	0	
Steven Linnett	Strategic Finance & Property	SP008	Land Drainage		0	0	0	Explore Community Payback to do some of this work as a cost avoidance measure?

Head of Service	Service	Cost Centre	Description	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Proposal
Helen Standen	Shared ICT Service	SS001	Shared ICT Service		-6	-6	-6	Subject to lease clawback.
Helen Standen	Shared ICT Service	SS001	Shared ICT Service		-20	-20	-20	End Print service
Helen Standen	Shared ICT Service	SS001	Shared ICT Service		-20	-20	-20	End design service

# 1 Chief Executive and Directors

Corporate Priority: Enabling our communities  
Portfolio Holder: Linda Haysey  
LT Lead: Richard Cassidy

CED1

## Description of Service:

This budget code represents the central costs of the Chief Executive and Deputy Chief Executive posts.

The cost of these posts are recharged across service budgets based on proportions of overall time allocated. These time allocations are reviewed annually.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

A chief officer review was undertaken in 2017/18 which resulted in a restructure, deleting a vacant Corporate Director post and developing the other Director post in the Deputy CE and providing an ongoing saving of circa £90k per annum.

A further review of the Councils senior management team will be undertaken in 2020/21 as part of a wider organisational review.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

These posts are high profile within the community and with stakeholders as they represent the Council at local, regional and national levels.

## VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£30*	£65*	£65*
Capital				

\*Savings as part of a wider senior management review.

## CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£296,480	£0	£296,480

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
---	----

<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	
--	--

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
Reduced salary costs	Impact on services due to reduction in management capacity.

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
May impact on performance	May impact on performance	May impact on performance	May impact on performance

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

Potential Redundancy costs unless the reduction is achieved by not replacing a post

# 1 Corporate Support Team

Corporate Priority: Enabling our communities  
Portfolio Holder: Linda Haysey  
LT Lead: Richard Cassidy

CED2

**Description of Service:**

This budget code represents the costs of the of the personal assistant support to the Leader of the Council, Chairman of the Council, Chief Executive & Deputy Chief Executive.

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

As part of a review undertaken in 2019/20 the team was restructured, providing an ongoing saving of £40,000 per annum.

A further review of the team will be undertaken in the next six months to identify additional efficiencies.

**What do the public say?:**  
Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

These are not public facing roles.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£5	£10	£10
Capital				

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£86,320	£0	£86,320

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

# 1 Remove policy function

**Description of Service:** Policy support to Leadership Team and Executive

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

We currently have a 0.6 WTE role at Grade 8 which supports Leadership Team and Executive with corporate policy work. This includes:

- Corporate planning (co-ordination of corporate plan, annual report, performance monitoring analysis and trends)
- Regular briefings and updates to Executive and Leadership Team on national and regional policy matters
- Support to Leader and Chief Executive on research and preparation for presentations at national/ regional events
- Registering assets of community value

Deleting the post would result in a revenue saving but there would be redundancy costs involved.

## What do the public say?:

No data from the public.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£25	£25	£25
Capital	0	0	0	0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£139	£0	£139

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A



**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
Revenue savings	Less capacity to respond to policy changes (eg. Around Unitary government) Registering assets of community value no longer supported

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Limited impact although less capacity for research around sustainable policy development	Limited impact although less support for regional events (eg. LSCC)	No process to register assets of community value	Limited impact

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Possible risks to not fulfilling obligations set out in Localism Act regarding Assets of Community Value (although as new legislation this has not been tested)

# 1 Remove Link Magazine

**Description of Service:** Link Magazine (production of content, printing of 60,000 copies then distribution to all households in District)

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Link magazine was reduced from 4 copies per year to 2 (a spring and summer edition), reducing original budget of £24,000 to £16,000. Agreement was subsequently to reduce this to a further one per year (over the summer) which would result in additional savings. Income (generated through selling advertising space) is budgeted at around £1k per edition.

We have the option of ceasing the physical production and printing of Link magazine entirely. This would create a full saving of £14,000 however it is suggested that a budget of £4,000 is retained in order to supplement our other channels of communication. This would involve boosting facebook posts, target google ads and further SEO as well as unlocking more functionality through our email marketing provider. This will provide much better value for money. In addition these channels provide stronger customer insight data in terms of views, interactions and customer behaviour.

There is the option to only produce a limited number of printed copies and distribute these directly to the residents who are not digitally engaged. However we do not have such a database and collecting/ maintaining this would negate most of the savings that can be derived.

## What do the public say?:

We have no metrics or feedback from members of the public which indicate whether Link Magazine is read and how much value it adds. Our only insight comes from Members who suggest residents who are not digitally engaged appreciate the hard copy. As well as not being able to understand readership, we are unable to seek content on the feedback and understand what people want to hear more/ less of.

In 2015 we included a promotion on the Link magazine that every reader could claim a free Hertford Theatre ticket to test readership. Only person claimed a free ticket out of a population of 144,000.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£10	£10	£10	£10
Capital	0	0	0	0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£16	£2	£14

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Initial assessment complete
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	Issue is that we have a lack of insight on who the digitally excluded are. In addition Link magazine is a promotional publication to share good news stories (it isn't about updating on specific services) so not receiving the information has a limited impact upon excluding individuals or communities with protected characteristics.

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
Revenue savings Reduced environmental impact (printing and distribution)	Potential exclusion of those not digitally enabled

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Less waste from printed production of material	N/A	Potential that not having it means some people cannot access the data however this cannot be quantified.	Supports move towards digital delivery

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
None (no statutory notices are published in the magazine and there is no legal requirement to produce it)

# 1 Reactive communications

**Description of Service:** Reduce size and scope of communications

## **Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

Currently the communications service has a pro-active (promoting campaigns) and reactive (responding to crises/ issues) function. The service also manages the website and intranet. Responsibilities are spread across the team (1x G11 manager, 2x G7 comms officers, 1x G8 digital content manager). As one of the comms officers has handed in their notice we have an opportunity to review the overall purpose and function of communications.

Not replacing the 0.8 WTE Grade 7 officer would result in around £30,000 revenue savings however the service would be impacted as follows:

- Reduction in most internal communications (eg. team update and internal comms exercises linked to East Herts Together)
- Reduction of comms support for some major campaigns (prioritizing 2/3 major pieces of work per year and ceasing support for other smaller promotions)
- Reduced response times for content publishing and copywriting on w/site
- Fewer press releases

This is option 1.

There is further scope to move to a completely reactive service which in practice means the communications will provide:

- Basic updates on the w/site and some limited development of functionality
- Capacity for producing and publishing content in reactive/ crisis response capacity (done through monitoring of social media, response to press enquiries and complaints)
- No campaign/ promotional support for projects or initiatives (including signposting to campaigns led by others)
- No regular customer communications (email marketing and multi-channel updates)
- No internal communications
- No communications support for wider regional or countywide work (Eg. Community Resilience Forum)

Although extreme Three Rivers DC have a model akin to this whereby 1 comms officer responds to issues and when they arrive. We could delete the communications manager role leaving just one comms officer and the digital content manager realizing savings of around £60,000 on top of the £30,000 above. This model would rely on individuals at senior levels (Member and officer) to be more directly responsible for communications and promotion themselves. There would be redundancy costs involved. This is option 2.

**What do the public say?:**

Little customer insight to council communications as a service.

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue				
Option 1	£0	£30	£30	£30
Option 2	£0	£90	£90	£90
Capital	0	0	0	0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£180	£0	£180

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No – but any restructure would require an EQIA to be undertaken
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

#### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Revenue savings	Risk that if council doesn't promote itself and the brand then reputation will be damaged due to residents filling in any voids/ gaps about the council themselves.

#### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Residents aren't aware of council work in this area	Residents aren't aware of council work in this area	Less direct dialogue and engagement with residents	Residents aren't aware of council work in this area

#### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

None

**Corporate Priority:** Digital by Design  
**Portfolio Holder:** George Cutting  
**LT Lead:** Ben Wood

1 **Digital Receptions**

## Description of Service: Digital receptions

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The digital reception consists of moving away from the traditional 9-5 staffed reception desks in Wallfields and Charringtons to a front of house presence where:

- Customers can “walk-in” to access a desktop/ phone in a secure booth to make enquiries/ payments/ applications/ book an appointment with an officer about housing/ benefits/ healthy hub/ licensing/ view registers
- Customers can check-in when they arrive for an appointment and be directed to interview room where they can speak to an officer on video conferencing equipment
- Self-scanning stations available for customers to submit copies of relevant documents
- 1x customer service advisor present as a floor walker to direct customers to booths/ interview rooms after check in
- Where possible, co-located with other services (TBC but may include citizens advice, CVS, DWP etc)

This will be supported by additional measures which will increase efficiency including:

- Proof of concept for webchat (beginning October 2020 and set to conclude with recommendations March 2021). Given telephony is the contact channel of choice for East Herts customers this may provide a cheaper contact channel
- Increasing range of payment options online and over the phone focused on services where there is no online or telephony payment facility including all types of licence, pre-application planning advice, land searches, street naming and numbering. A business case has been agreed for this work however no timescale has yet been agreed with IT for implementation
- Stopping acceptance of cheque and cash payments (in line with the above project to ensure other payment channels are available)
- Decommissioning payment kiosks (lease due to expire 2022 and they will not be renewed)
- Forced migration to self-service on the website by removing downloadable pdf forms and only offering webforms

Please note design work had taken place on Wallfields reception in terms of changing the layout to facilitate self-service for customers. This work has been put on hold pending. No further investment is planned in Charrington’s for the same reason. Co-location will be explored as part of the wider agile working policy.

The current customer service establishment is 13.00 WTE. Since Covid-19 restrictions were imposed we have had 11.00 WTE in place and kept two posts vacant. Call handling performance has increased as both receptions are no longer fully staffed.

We are partially re-opening receptions on an appointment basis only from early October however it is suggested that for 20/21 the 2 vacant posts can be deleted on the basis that we will not be going back to the 9-5 staffed model.

Additional savings may be possible thereafter as part of wider and continuing review of customer services including consolidation of first points of contact for planning and housing

and health in customer services. There are also direct savings from decommissioning use of the kiosks.

**What do the public say?:**

Govmetric feedback for Face to Face services is our most highly rated channel. East Herts is often in the top 10 of authorities in the country who use face to face with 90% of customers often rating their experience as good. Removing F2F will not be popular with some customers however we have not had large numbers of complaints since we shut the offices in late March.

**VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000**

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£50 (deletion of 2 vacant advisor posts)	£63 (additional £13k from stopping kiosk lease from KPRS and G4S security services for cash handling)	£63
Capital	0	0	0	0

**CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£532	£0	£532

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Complete for reopening of receptions late October however further work will be required on full digital model
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	On average we have around 20,000 visits to the receptions per year. Some of these will be customers with immediate or time critical needs (eg. benefits or housing related). The booking system means seeing an office immediately may not be possible however once launched (October 2020) we will explore the effectiveness of being able to do this.

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
Revenue savings Increased performance on telephony contact (which is the main contact channel for East Herts residents) Reduced capital overheads if reception floor space needs are reduced	Potential for services to not be able to respond as well to customers in crisis who present

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Reduced floor space and associated needs Scanned documents instead of printing reducing environmental impact	More modern payment channels for customers and clients	Potential for lower scores on govmetric and customers not being able to access face to face support	Supports move towards digital delivery

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None (there will still be provision for customers to view documents in person such as the enforcement and electoral register)



# 1 Economic Development re-purpose

Corporate Priority:	Economic Growth
Portfolio Holder:	Jan Goodeve
LT Lead:	Ben Wood

**Description of Service:** Economic development reduced in size and scope to just focus on delivering income generating services (ie. The Launchpad)

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Currently the economic development service is responsible for various activities as follows:

- Commissioning support and contract management for Visit Herts, Better Business for All
- Liaison with planning policy on key site development and economic impacts of major applications (this ranges from larger projects such as HGGT and ORL to smaller developments such as Caxton Hill/ Tamworth Road)
- Liaising with new businesses (finding premises, signposting to support and grant schemes)
- Inputting into wider partnership meetings, studies and work programmes (LSCC, DIZ, HEDOG)
- Liaison with town councils and town centres on high street challenges, issues and events (eg. This year it includes project managing the spend of RHSS funds)
- Running the Bishop's Stortford and Ware Launchpad
- Additional ad hoc projects as required (eg. The JobSmart scheme)

We could reduce the size and scope of the service to just focus just on the Launchpad which provides direct support to businesses as well as income. This would mean:

- Changing JD for Economic Development manager to be Launchpad Manager (possible saving if scale is reduced – Grade 10 to Grade 8 - £13,000). If existing post holder remains then there would be pay protection for a period of time meaning full saving would not be realized until 2022/23.
- Deletion of Economic Development officer post (role is shared with North Herts so saving is 0.5 WTE at Grade 8 – around £22,000. Redundancy costs would be involved.

All the activity above – other than the Launchpad – would cease. We have recently signed an agreement to deliver an ERDF funded business support programme on expanding the Launchpad (income for which is used to off-set our cash contribution to the project). Day to day running of the Launchpad as well as project management for this new work would be the sole function of economic development.

## What do the public say?:

These services are not directly visible to members of the public however businesses that receive direct or indirect support may see an impact.

**VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000**

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£22	£35	£35
Capital	0	0	0	0

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£105	(£40)	£65,000

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No – although any restructure would require an EQIA to be undertaken
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Revenue savings Focus just on revenue generating activity	Likely that partners will feel district council is not concerned about economic wellbeing – particularly on town centres Risk that some commercial elements of new developments are overlooked Council will essentially have no capacity to undertake any economic development work other than running the Launchpad Joint working with North Herts would cease

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Limited impact	Removal of a large part of the activities and actions within the economic theme	Limited impact	Limited impact

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
None

# 1 Review of membership fees

**Description of Service:** Membership fees for economic development

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

We currently pay into the following organisations as follows:

- London Stansted Cambridge Corridor: £10,000 per annum (no timescales for review). Regional economic partnership (private and public sector) which lobbies for additional investment for government and undertakes marketing for inward investment for businesses
- Digital Innovation Zone (DIZ): £10,000 per annum (initially for 2 years – 2019/20 and 2020/21). East Herts and West Essex partnership (public and private) which shares best practice on digital collaboration and lobbies/ bids for digital infrastructure investment
- Central Zone Alliance (CZA): £15,000 per annum (Initially for 2 years – 2020/21 and 2021/22 sub-group of 5 districts in the in the LSCC who want to raise their profile. Currently this is not budgeted for and is paid supported through underspends elsewhere in the service
- Better business for All (BBfA): £5000 per annum (Initially for 2 years – 2018/19 and 2019/20. Nb paid 50% from economic development and 50% from housing and health) Partnership of herts local authority regulators (rates, trading standards, licensing etc) who collaborate to make regulatory support for businesses more streamlined
- Visit Herts: £5000 per annum (aligned to LEP contract with VH which expires 2021/22) contracted to deliver destination management and tourism services for Hertfordshire on behalf of LEP and 8 districts.

On the basis that for every organization except the LSCC we have entered temporary/ fixed term arrangements we can honour our agreements and then cease funding thereafter.

The LSCC and DIZ Boards have Executive Member presence on their Boards.

Generally speaking withdrawing from the CZA and BBfA would be the least controversial options.

## What do the public say?:

None of these organisations - with the possible exception of Visit Herts who have a website to promote business and attractions – are widely known to the public.

## VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
--	---------	---------	---------	---------

Revenue	£0	£5 (BBfA)	£20 (BBfA, DIZ and VH)*	£20
Capital	0	0	0	0

\*doesn't include £15,000 saving from the CZA as it isn't budgeted for

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£38	£0	£38

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
Revenue savings	<p>Potential loss of profile and reputation amongst other organisations who are members (especially with regards to LSCC and DIZ)</p> <p>In the case of Visit Herts some businesses may feel we are not supporting the tourism sector.</p>

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Economic Growth</b>	<b>Enabling Communities</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
Limited impact	Withdrawing from the LSCC and Visit Herts would be seen as being less supportive of businesses	Limited impact	The DIZ is a large part of our partnership working within this theme

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
None

# 1 Launchpad

Corporate Priority: Economic Growth  
Portfolio Holder: Jan Goodeve  
LT Lead: Ben Wood

**Description of Service:** See proposal to reduce economic development to just Launchpad service only

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

We have signed up to an ERDF project (£1.2m over 3 years) to support business expansion. The project is match funded so £600k (£200k per year) comes from the ERDF and the same from East Herts. We are using existing costs to make up around £150k of this and the additional cash will come from Launchpad income.

We therefore have to make £50k per income for the project to be sustainable and that is the target we will be working to. Any income has to go towards the project so can't be added to general income.

No savings or income proposals attached.

## What do the public say?:

No data from the public.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	0	0	0	0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£0	£0	£0

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
----------	----------

--	--

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
--	--	--	--

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

None
------

# 1 Remove Capital Project Support

**Description of Service:** The Major Projects Team supports delivery of Old River Lane, Hertford Theatre and Leisure Services (Hartham and Grange Paddocks).

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

There is a separate review of capital projects in place. As the posts are linked to the projects should any projects cease we can delete the posts. The revenue saving would be £210k plus £70k capital per year.

## What do the public say?:

No data from the public.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	0	0	0	0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£280	£0	£280

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Revenue savings	No capacity to support projects

### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Limited impact	ORL not delivered	Leisure Services and	Limited impact

Hertford Theatre not delivered

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None



1 **Rural Development Programme**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Economic Growth</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Jan Goodeve</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Ben Wood</b>

**Description of Service:** Project has now ceased. No expenditure in this budget.

# 1 Tourism

Corporate Priority:	Economic Growth
Portfolio Holder:	Jan Goodeve
LT Lead:	Ben Wood

**Description of Service:** No expenditure in this budget. Tourism budget reduced from £20k in 15/16 to £5k which pays for Visit Herts and comes out of another budget.

1 **Town Centres**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Economic Growth</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Jan Goodeve</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Ben Wood</b>

**Description of Service:** No expenditure in this budget.

## H&H17 (CW001)

**Corporate Priority:** Enabling communities  
**Portfolio Holder:** Cllr Peter Boylan, Cllr Eric Buckmaster, Cllr Suzanne Rutland-Barsby  
**LT Lead:** Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

Salaries and associated staffing costs to carry out non-statutory health and well-being work and oversight /work on community safety and safeguarding matters which have a statutory component.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Community Wellbeing and Partnerships team in Housing and Health has five project / programme officers:

- ASB & Community Safety Manager (grade 9)
- Projects & New Business Manager (0.81 FTE grade 8)
- Housing and Health Projects Officer (0.81 FTE grade 7)
- Healthy Lifestyles Programme Officer (grade 9)
- Community Wellbeing Programme Officer (grade 9).

This equates to 4.6 FTE.

These officers all have different JDs and are all occupied on a number of high profile projects and programmes.

Reduce the headcount from 4.6 FTE to 3.6 FTE. This is most likely to be achieved by deletion of one full-time post. The exact details of this have not yet been determined pending LT's in principle support.

If this proposal progressed:

- it should be noted that if member of staff could not be redeployed redundancy costs are likely.
- there presumptions have been made about the grade of the 1 FTE reduction. The modelling below is based on a grade 9 post
- there could be knock-on job re-evaluations to accommodate a reduction in posts. The costs of this have not been included in the modelling below
- this restructure could accommodate the withdrawal from the Hertfordshire Resilience Partnership (see separate efficiencies template). It is assumed that taking on a HCC officers via TUPE can be avoided (as they are less than 50% at EHC)
- to accommodate staff consultation and notice, the efficiency is assumed to commence half way through 2021/22 in the modelling below.

**What do the public say?:**

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
--	---------	---------	---------	---------

Revenue	£0	£25	£50	£50
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£469	£13	£456

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No – would need to form part of the restructure consultation documentation
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity to rationalise roles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially demotivated staff</li> <li>Increased workload for remaining staff may reduce capacity to focus on other aspects of work. Potential for this change to be felt by the public engaging with these services</li> <li>Savings may only be realised over the longer term when the potential for redundancy payments in the short term is factored in</li> </ul>

### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Usual legal and HR aspects of a restructure where officers are put at risk would need to be observed

## H&H19 (CW101)

Corporate Priority:	Enabling Communities
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Peter Boylan
LT Lead:	Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

Emergency planning-related contracts – Hertfordshire Resilience Partnership contract and Lone Worker call-handing by Stevenage CCTV.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

End subscription to the Hertfordshire Emergency Planning / Resilience Partnership and incorporate the functions within the job description of an existing/revised role within East Herts. The notice period to withdraw from the Partnership would be confirmed should LT give 'in principle' support to explore this further. For modelling purposes, the efficiency is here represented in full from 2021/22. This would need to be refined based on the notice period.

It is assumed that there is no increase in East Herts staffing costs (even from a job re-evaluation if this change was incorporated into a restructure of the Community Wellbeing and Partnerships team in Housing and Health).

We do not believe there are any TUPE implications.

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£26	£26	£26
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£32	£0	£32

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL****POSITIVE**

- No significant reduction to public services as it believed duties can be absorbed into existing East Herts staff base

**NEGATIVE**

- Increased pressures on existing EHC officers
- 

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability

Economic Growth

Enabling Communities

Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None

## H&H19 (CW101)

Corporate Priority: Enabling Communities  
Portfolio Holder: Cllr Peter Boylan  
LT Lead: Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

Community safety activities – net cost (excluding planned PCSOs contribution deletion in 2021/22, see below) represents small amount of CCTV costs.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The income noted below relates to (a) grant income from the PCC for community safety work to cover costs in the expenditure half of this budget; this is simply in-out – income/costs pound for pound. and (b) income from town councils for CCTV, the expenditure for which is noted elsewhere in the budget; this is simply in-out – income/costs pound for pound.

No efficiencies proposed.

The £50k net costs in 2020/21 will reduce by £44k in 2021/22 with the removal of the remaining PCSO contribution. This was approved by Council on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2020.

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£160	£109	£50 NOTE: £44 reduction in 2021/22 already approved by Council

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

#### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
----------	----------



--	--

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

## H&H21 (CW103) Community Projects

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Enabling communities</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Cllr Suzanne Rutland-Barbsy</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Jonathan Geall</b>

**Description of Service:** Community revenue grants, SLA payment to CVS and sports grants.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

- Reduction of £6k in Sports Development budget to bring in line with current SLA to Active In the Community of £10k.  
ADDITIONAL
- Reduction of a further £10k to remove all Sports Development grant funding.  
ADDITIONAL
- Reduction of 25% of community revenue grants budget, that is, £11k.  
ADDITIONAL
- Reduction of a further 25% of community revenue grants budget (50% in total), £11k.

NOTE: CVS's grant was reduced in 2020/21 and 2021/22 (approved by Council on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2020). It was rolled together into one year (2020/21) and is represented in the CAB budget rather than here. No further reduction is proposed here.

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	a) £6 b) £10 c) £11 d) £11 TOTAL = £38	a) £6 b) £10 c) £11 d) £11 TOTAL = £38	a) £6 b) £10 c) £11 d) £11 TOTAL = £38
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£79	£0	£79

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL****POSITIVE**

- Budget efficiency
- Potential for sports development to be directly accessed from other bodies such as Sport England
- Increased drive to self-sufficiency among community groups

**NEGATIVE**

- Council retraction from sports development (groups would have to find alternative funding sources)
- Reduced community revenue grants pot (group would have to find alternative sources, including via crowd funding and the East Herts Lottery)

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability

Economic Growth

Enabling Communities

Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

## H&H4,5 (EH001, EH101)

Corporate Priority:	Economic Growth
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Eric Buckmaster
LT Lead:	Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

EH001 = Environmental Health staffing budget and associated costs

EH101 = Direct costs of food sampling, water sampling, food inspection, vets, publicity

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

A change in the way the team works and the introduction of the pooled electric cars mean that the need for dedicated vans for Environmental Health has reduced. We will therefore not renew the contracts for the three vans at the end of their current contract. This represents a financial efficiency.

Environmental Health is a statutory service. Work has commenced on comparing the East Herts structure with that of other authorities. This work is ongoing, however findings to date indicate that on a like-for-like basis, we've found that the commercial and environmental pollution elements of Environmental Health are staffed as follows:

- East Herts – 10.41 FTE
- East Devon – 13 FTE
- Tunbridge Wells – 13.5 FTE
- Maidstone – 12.08 FTE
- Swale – 9 FTE

The team continues to restructure to deliver efficiencies:

- currently we are trialling sharing our Environmental Sustainability Co-ordinator with Stevenage BC for six months. Possibly this could become permanent. We are currently using the freed up revenue to employ a fixed term assistant to the Co-ordinator
- we have converted Environmental Health Practitioner posts to Technical Officer posts to reduce and stretch resources
- 18 months ago we deleted the engineering function and delivered an efficiency.

We are not proposing any further staffing efficiencies at this stage.

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£10	£12	£12
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

**CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£985	£35	£950

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
1. Reduction in financial costs 2. Potential reduction in damage to the environment if electric vehicles used instead	

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

## H&H6 (EH104)

Corporate Priority:	Sustainability
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Graham McAndrew
LT Lead:	Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

Monitoring of air pollution/quality and land contamination and noise monitoring.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Reduce the air quality budget (£16,850) and thus monitoring and some interventions  
Reduction of £6,000 achieved over three years

No proposed reduction in land contamination budget or noise monitoring

### What do the public say?:

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£2	£4	£6
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£29	£0	£29

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No, but one should be before this is considered.
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
1. Revenue efficiency	1. Some reduction in extent of air quality monitoring (but considered manageable)

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Negative			

## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

## H&H12 (EH106)

Corporate Priority: Enabling communities  
Portfolio Holder: Cllr Peter Boylan  
LT Lead: Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

Payment to reserve for future house condition surveys, fee income from HMO licences and allowance for repayment of capital grants

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The budget includes an annualised £50,000 payment towards future house condition surveys. It is felt that such survey either cease, are funded from reserves already accumulated and/or a funded on an if/when basis (perhaps jointly with other authorities to achieve economies of scale). This would remove a £50,000 from the budget.

This cost centre includes an 'odd' income target for repayment of (part) of previous capital grants to individual householders if they subsequently sell their property within a certain period, typically 10 years (on a sliding scale). It is 'odd' as this would appear to be a capital repayment. It is proposed to remove this income target as (a) there is no way of telling whether any repayments will become due within a year, (b) with fewer grants being made and DFGs now handled by the Hertfordshire Home Improvement Agency (HHIA) there is less scope for repayment and (c) as part of the efficiency (taking three years ago) to join the HHIA to post which led on chasing up these payments was deleted.

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue – ceasing house condition survey payments	£0	£50	£50	£50
Revenue – removing grant repayment income target	£0	-£19	-£19	-£19
NET	£0	£31	£31	£31
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£51	£29	£21



**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**Has an EQIA been completed?**  
(If yes, date to be added)

No

**What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?**

N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

**POSITIVE**

3. Revenue efficiency

**NEGATIVE**

1. Need to consider scaled back approach to private house condition survey

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability

Economic Growth

Enabling Communities

Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

## H&H11 (HG001)

Corporate Priority:	Enabling communities
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Peter Boylan
LT Lead:	Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

Housing staffing providing statutory homelessness and allocating of affordable housing functions and non-strategy development function

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

No efficiency is proposed.

The demand on the Housing team is growing due to (a) the difficult economic situation, exacerbated by Covid-19, (b) continued housing price and housing rent inflation from a high starting point and (c) the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 adding to the duties to temporarily house and assist homeless people.

By way of example of the growth in the workload, 2018/19 an average of just five households were temporarily housed in b&b at any one time; the figure is now 21 *excluding additional need resulting from coronavirus*.

The two officers carrying out housing development, strategy and research activities fulfil non-statutory functions. That said, these officers provide essential advice to Planning re: affordable housing requirements on s106 sites, Harlow Gilston Garden Town and other strategic sites. They manage the council's relationship with the 16 registered providers currently operating in the district.

The Housing service funds a considerable number of officers and services from government grants for homelessness prevention so as to relieve pressure on the base budget.

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£661	£0	£661

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
---	----

<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A
--	-----

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
4.	2.

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

## H&H14 (HG102)

Corporate Priority: Enabling communities  
Portfolio Holder: Cllr Peter Boylan  
LT Lead: Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

Internal recharge only

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

No efficiency is proposed

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£18	£0	£18

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

#### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
5.	3.

#### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

## H&H15 (HG103)

Corporate Priority: Enabling communities  
Portfolio Holder: Cllr Peter Boylan  
LT Lead: Jonathan Geall

**Description of Service:** Budget covering expenditure of Homelessness Grant monies on various activities to reduce/handle homelessness including rent deposits, housing options interventions in pursuit of the council's statutory homelessness duties. Grant income and some temporary accommodation income included in this budget.

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

No efficiency is proposed. *Note: much of the net budget shown is covered by government grant specifically provided for these purposes.*

The demand on the Housing team is growing due to (a) the difficult economic situation, exacerbated by Covid-19, (b) continued housing price and housing rent inflation from a high starting point and (c) the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 adding to the duties to temporarily house and assist homeless people.

By way of example of the growth in the workload, 2018/19 an average of just five households were temporarily housed in b&b at any one time; the figure is now 21 *excluding additional need resulting from coronavirus.*

**What do the public say?:**

**VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)**

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

**CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£251	£80	£171

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

**POSITIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

6.

4.

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability

Economic Growth

Enabling Communities

Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

## H&H16 (HG104)

Corporate Priority: Enabling communities  
Portfolio Holder: Cllr Peter Boylan  
LT Lead: Jonathan Geall

**Description of Service:** Salary, running costs and income relating to Hillcrest Hostel. This budget represents a net income (excluding provision for bad debt which is accounted for outside of Housing and Health cost centres).

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

No efficiency is proposed.

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£81	£121	-£40

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

#### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
7.	5.

#### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS



## H&H 1,2,3 (LN001, RLN101, LN101)

Corporate Priority:	Economic Growth
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Peter Boylan
LT Lead:	Jonathan Geall

### Description of Service:

LN001 = Staffing and associated costs associated with processing applications for, issuing and enforcing taxi licences, premises licences, gambling licences and scrap metal licences

RLN101, LN101 = Income to covers eligible costs

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

None proposed. Relatively small net budget for team and function.

Fees for taxi licences by law should be levied on a cost recovery basis only. Other licences are set by statute and/or local benchmarking and are increased by inflation each year

### What do the public say?:

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£352	£311	£41

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

#### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
8.	6.

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability

Economic Growth

Enabling Communities

Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

## 1 HR&OD (HR1)

### Description of Service:

Provision of HR, OD, Payroll and H&S services to the council and also to Hertford Town Council and some income re training courses and work supporting Datchworth Parish Council in terms of HR.

The service includes processing new starters and leavers (as well internal moves/secondments), running payroll, advising on OD, H&S and HR matters, developing employment policies and procedures, supporting recruitment, developing and delivering/commissioning training. HR supporting managers with people management etc.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

#### **Staffing/Staffing Costs of Service – No reduction proposed – income from staffing resource and training to be increased:**

The staffing budget has been reduced in terms of HR Officer FTEs in recent times as well as in HR admin regarding a 1 day reduction following previous rounds. Some investment has however been made in the Trainee HR Officer full-time post developed from the previous HR Apprentice role. Revenue budgets were also reduced in terms of staff training pots held by HR, in previous reduction rounds as well as investment in staff benefits for MyRewards.

#### **Increase in Income based on providing more HR, OD and H&S support Externally and selling e-learning and face to face training places to our partners or customers.**

Currently HR have an income value of £1,000, this was exceeded last year by almost double with an out-turn of £1,730 compared to £850 the year before. We will be revising our prices for HTC who have very low terms from 2016, we have increased charges for new customers' Datchworth Parish Council although this work will not amount to that much and have begun working with Ware Town Council and Hertfordshire Building Control. We are confident that without increase our staffing capacity or costs we can deliver an income of £10,000 in 21-22 and in this year we could achieve £4,000 without increasing our staffing further.

**Potential increase in income = £3,000 (20-21) and £9,000 (21-22)**

#### **Potential savings:**

##### **4401 Misc Hired & Contracted Services 14,000**

This budget is used up fully on the annual cost of **MyRewards** – which has been renewed at this price for one year until October 2021. This could be cut and therefore save 5 months cost in 21-22 which would equate to **£5,800**. It is worth noting that this potential saving would not be supported by the feedback from staff forum that this benefit is really useful to staff who when they use MyRewards effectively are saving around £1,000 per annum – if we do move away from MyRewards we would be able to replace the cycle to work scheme from another provider (which is included in MyRewards) and if take up remains reasonable it would not cost anything further than the cost already incurred by lending staff the purchase

price up front due to savings on NI.

**0684 Occupational Health 5,500**

This budget has been increased this year but the increase is shown in the 10k labelled as Special items, a new provider from the county framework has been sourced but it involved an annual upfront cost and higher (P.A.Y.G) doctor assessment costs. The Head of HR was trying to negotiate the cost down from approximately £9,000 with the additional 3.5k being funded from the 10k special items. The cost could potentially be reduced by removing pre-employment questionnaires for all new starters which can instead be pre-filtered and used where required and therefore reduce the number required. HR are confident we could negotiate a better deal but are keen to move away from the current provider due to concerns re the quality of the medical/occupational advice received and the need to support staff back to work in reasonable timescales.

Based on a combined budget of £9,000, HR believe this could be reduced to £7,500 which would mean a budget reduction of **£1,500 from the special items** this could be implemented this year and next.

**8100 Special Items 10,000**

In addition to the suggested reduction of £1,500 above, this pot could be reduced further by **£5,000** as this was added as part of the special items for professional training which was expected to exceed the 20k budget by at least 5k clearly this would mean we would be limited to the previous 20k and the number of staff supported through this fund which can easily be spent on 4-5 staff being developed each year especially if we are funding 100% due it being hard to recruit. The remaining 1.5k left would be used to fund flu vaccinations (approximately £700 but this may increase based on demand) and to support other costs e.g. additional professional training or in-house training not covered by existing pots or where medical needs have proved more costly.

**0651 Long Service Awards 2,450**

There is a potential custom and practice on this and it also a potential concern re age discrimination re the practice continuing (normally no more than 4-5 years should be recognised). EHC also now pay a nominal £25 per month staff recognition award so you can argue we are recognising performance rather than length of service. HR believe this could be cut and it would save £2,450, it could be from this year or next and would involve staff consultation potentially as well as discussion/negotiation with Unison. - – **Potential £2,450 saving**

**Other Potential Small Savings**

**3572 Postages 800**

Postage Costs – reduce from £800 to £400 in line with decreasing post and also more online payslips for members and casual staff – this should be achieved by 21-22 it has been delayed by lockdown re casuals. – **Potential £400 saving**

**Other considerations – Local Training Budgets**

**Although not a direct HR budget, we suggest the local training pots in 20-21 are reduced back by the 12k increase from 19-20 which we have been told was increased due to overspends.** However in line with the need for saving it is not proposed for HR's central training pots to be increased but the 12k could be saved across local service training pots, also a decision to increase training budgets and how/where should be discussed with HR and LT rather than such changes not being considered beyond Finance as we are One Team and there needs to be shared ownership.

**- Potential 12k reduction to Local training pots**

A related consideration may be to centralise the local training pots and create a short-course external training pot for short courses and conferences. The administration of this budget and the booking of courses etc. would need to be resourced. HR do not have the capacity to administer this in terms of booking/processing but if shared admin team was created this could be administered by this team with the OD&HR Co-ordinator co-ordinating this work. Currently staff in bigger teams have more training budget meaning it is very difficult to support short-course professional courses or updates in small services e.g. HR where the local annual budget is £880 and can be easily spent on 2-3 courses. A shared approval process would need to be developed and priorities agreed with LT.

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

N/A

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£12,000 across services re local training  £6,500 (Special xxx (LTS) £400 (postage)  <b>Total HR = £6,900</b>	£12,000 across services  £5,800 (Myrewards) £6,500 (Special) £2,450 (LTS) £400 (postage)  <b>Total HR = £15,150</b>	£12,000 across services  £14,000 (Myrewards) £6,500 (Special) £2,450 (LTS) £400 (postage)  <b>Total HR = £23,350</b>	£12,000 across services  £14,000(Myrewards) £6,500 (Special) £2,450 (LTS) £400 (postage)  <b>Total HR = £23,350</b>
Capital				
Income	+3k	+9k	+11k	+14k

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£468,570	£1,000	

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Not undertaken
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	TBD

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Savings to budget,	Reduced staff benefits – impact on morale
Better value from training should be	Reduced funds for OHA

achieved by centralizing – will need admin support to continue	Reduced funds for training
--	----------------------------

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

HR Supports all

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

N/A – other than we will still need provision for employment legal support from Legal e.g. through B&D as we are ending Expert HR as previously discussed

## 1 Apprentices (HR2)

### Description of Service:

The Apprentice Budget is a staffing budget used to fund Apprentices in terms of their salaries, originally the budget supported 6 apprentices but increases in Apprenticeship rates especially in relation to year 2 costs onwards means the employment of suitable apprentices is limited to 5 or 4 based on the current budget, (it is reduced further when apprentices move into year 2, at this stage the 73k budget can only fund 4 and may still over spend dependent on ages of the apprentices).

By employing and developing apprentices it allows EHC to access our Levy Pot (Approximately 37k) to fund their development as well as funding permanent staff where applicable to develop professionally and achieve suitable qualifications, EHC have to allow 20% off the job development (which is paid time) i.e. attendance at college to undertake their development, complete course work and take exams etc.

The apprenticeship salary budget does need to be recognised as an investment budget in terms of growing our own or at least growing suitable skills for our sector in terms having people with the required skills. It should be noted that outside of planning or specialist apprentices (HR and Finance) we have tended to have 2-3 Admin apprentices these are great opportunities for our community in terms of supporting young people or less experienced people into work but these are not normally hard to recruit roles.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Apprentice budget has been looked at by LT on the 1<sup>st</sup> of September 2020 where it was agreed to recruit up to 3 more apprentices on top of the existing 2, this is possible in 20-21 because up to October (over half of the year) the budget is only supporting 2 apprentices but next year as was reported to LT the budget would need to increase as Apprentices would increase in salary half way through the financial year. It may also be that NLW rates will increase from April 2021 and based on previous rises this could be an increase of around 50p per hour.

Below is a forecast of costs for this year and then a forecast for next year which demonstrates the issues. Please details below which have been moved on landscape so they can be read:







## Options

Current recruitment has been put on hold to allow all options.

### OPTION 1

- **No further recruitment – retain current 2 only, Planning Trainee funded fully by planning from 21/22 – Central Budget reduced the deleted as apprentices complete**

<b>20-21 (Savings)</b>	£40,000
<b>21-22</b>	£53,000
<b>22-23</b>	£73,000
<b>23-34</b>	£73,000

If the central pot is cut, it would then be for Services to identify apprenticeship roles in their own staffing budgets as we do with Trainee posts.

### OPTION 2

- **Recruitment Limited to 3 more with Planning Trainee funded fully by Planning from 21/22**

<b>20-21 (Savings)</b>	£0
<b>21-22</b>	£0 - £8,000 depends on age of those employed
<b>22-23</b>	Would depend if more recruited by central
<b>23-34</b>	If no more recruited = £73,000

### OPTION 3

- **Recruitment Limited to 2 more with Planning Trainee funded fully by Planning from 21/22**

<b>20-21 (Savings)</b>	£25,000
<b>21-22</b>	£17,000
<b>22-23</b>	Would depend if more recruited by central
<b>23-34</b>	If no more recruited = £73,000

### **What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public and central government will expect the council to have Apprentices but clearly it is a difficult economic climate and if service incorporate locally to staffing budgets they can continue.

### **VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)**

	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
	See above re options			

### **CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
73050	If 2 apprentices taken on 3-4k in grants will be realised	73050 plus 3-4k

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Not undertaken It could be argued a reduction will effect younger people disproportionately and therefore indirect discrimination but we do not limit ages applying in line with Age discrimination rules. Also not cutting the central will mean saving need to be found elsewhere which could lead to redundancies increasing.
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	TBD

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<p><b>Saving could be as high as 73k</b> Max Savings to budget = Option 1 – by making this cut it can contribute to reduce redundancies By limiting to 2 we will stay in budget and make savings this year Savings are significant without redundancy costs being incurred By limiting to 4 in total funded from the budget we can save a further 16k</p>	<p>If services seek to self-fund from their staff budgets the negative impacts will be removed or reduced: EHC will not be supporting a key government agenda to provide apprenticeships at the levels EHC set out to, we have already had to reduce to a maximum of 5. A reduction in this investment is also not supportive of the both Es in corporate SEED priorities. Apprenticeships are a measure to support growth and hard to fill career areas Levy funds may go unspent</p>

### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

The apprenticeship budget can support all of SEED as stated above the most likely to be affected and both Economic growth and Enabling Communities as the cut may reduce potential growth and may not have the same level of opportunities for our community.

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

N/A – other than points about not recruiting a paralegal as hard to recruit area

# 1 Legal Services Restructure

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Geoff Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	James Ellis

## Description of Service: Legal Services

The core business of a local authority legal department is to provide corporate and operational legal advice, assistance and support to its employing authority for the benefit of the community the authority have been set up to serve.

It is there to provide the legal, corporate and constitutional support the authority regularly and routinely needs.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Ending the use of locum solicitors and reducing the use of external legal provision by employing full time solicitors on permanent contracts.

This gap in service delivery has been filled with a variety of expensive external legal solutions which have never been entirely satisfactory.

LT have agreed a 4 solicitor option with all four posts being graded 10 to 11; up from 2 solicitors at grade 10 only. The cost of Agency staff has previously been offset by the underspend generated by having two vacant solicitor's posts, meaning that the overspend in 2019/20 was **£29,668.78**.

Doubling the number of posts from 2 to 4, and increasing the top grade at which they will be recruited to, will initially show an additional spend in the first year, however it is envisaged that as the solicitors become established in the roles, there will be less reliance on the need to go externally for legal advice, as well as an increased capacity to offer legal services to neighbouring authorities, thus generating an income.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Whilst not a front facing service as such, there is some exposure to the public in the form of residents affected by breach of planning, for example, and the expectation on the council to "do something" about it.

Injunctions and the prosecution of individuals for various offences, such as fly-tipping, breaches of premises licences and other areas also require legal to come into contact with the public and affect things that the public care about.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	+£31 (additional cost – no saving in 20/21)	£6	£26	£63
Capital				

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£260	0	£260

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher fees are payable to locum solicitors and external legal providers, whereas internal permanent staff cost a significant amount less.</li> <li>Increasing the number of staff and having expertise in-house will eventually allow EHDC to offer services to other Local Authorities and generate an income.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unknown what level of solicitor/lawyer is available in the current market, may not be able to attract the right sort of candidate to the role.</li> <li>Currently able to tap into Partner level advice, which would be improbable from likely new recruits.</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Providing a quality service to areas such as planning and operations.	Internal facing income	N/A	N/A

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

This gap in service delivery has been filled with a variety of expensive external legal solutions which have never been entirely satisfactory.

It is hoped that were the proposed changes agreed, the legal team at East Herts can begin to offer a much needed service to the council at a significantly reduced cost.

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enter text here
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Cllr George Cutting</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>James Ellis</b>

## 1 **Webcasting cessation**

### **Description of Service:**

Cessation of non-statutory provision of webcasting of public meetings.

### **Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

The proposal is for a saving from the cessation of webcasting at public meetings.

There is a legal requirement that public meetings must be open to the public to attend. For physical meetings, this requirement is fulfilled by the fact that any member of the public who wishes to attend a public meeting in person may do so. The legal requirement was amended under coronavirus legislation for online meetings. Now, public participation in meetings which are held remotely is accomplished by livestreaming of meetings. The platforms being used are Zoom and the Council's YouTube channel.

Therefore, webcasting is currently not necessary for livestreaming. Webcasting is currently only being used to upload archive recordings. Archive recordings are not a statutory requirement but are regarded as useful, particularly for regulatory meetings in case of appeal. However, the Zoom recordings are also available as archive recordings on YouTube.

If an internal solution to livestreaming physical meetings can be identified for when meetings are held physically, there would be no reliance on the webcasting provider for this service.

There is therefore a business case for no longer using webcasting for livestreaming or archive recording. The current contract ends on 30 April 2021.

Questions which IT are being asked to advise on are whether new cameras would need to be purchased, as these are leased from the webcasting provider; whether the suggested solution of an iPad camera would be able to connect to the microphones; and whether if there are hybrid meetings with some people connecting from Zoom, such meetings can be livestreamed from the Council Chamber.

### **What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

East Herts Council has webcast certain meetings for over 10 years. Viewing meetings online is standard practice, and enhances transparency of decision-making. Moving to an alternative platform for livestreaming should not be viewed as a problematic departure from webcasting and has now been operational for a number of months over the Coronavirus period.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	0	£14,879	0	0
Capital	0	0	0	0

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£14,879	£0	£14,879

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Cost saving of ceasing payment to external provider of webcasting service</p> <p>Potential staff overtime costs if equipment can be run independently of Democratic Services Officer at meeting</p> <p>Saving of administrative time in uploading recorded files to webcasting site and adding timing tags</p> <p>Stream all meetings not just Council, Executive and DMC meetings</p>	<p>Purchase of equipment for streaming from Council Chamber, approximately £1,600, and stand approximately £35 plus any re-provision of audio equipment.</p> <p>Loss of “gold plated” service of focusing on each speaker.</p>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Potentially would enable hybrid meetings which could reduce carbon emissions from all Members traveling to meetings	None	Public access to livestreamed meetings would be available for all meetings, not just Council, Executive and DMC, as is the case under the webcasting contract	All meetings held in the Council Chamber could be livestreamed (and if the equipment was mobile, possibly from other venues too)



## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

During Covid restrictions, it is necessary to livestream meetings to meet public participation requirement. Post-Covid restrictions this may not be the case, in which case provision of a webcasting service would effectively be an “add on” for meetings held physically.

## 2 Convene Independent Remuneration Panel only once every four years

### Description of Service:

Convene Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) only once every four years

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The IRP usually meets every year to review the Members' Scheme of Allowances. The recommendations of the Panel are submitted to Council, which decides whether to accept the proposals. The legislation (The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003) allows for indexation for a maximum of 4 years before the panel must be reconvened. The Council must have an IRP, and must have regard to its recommendations. In order to decide to use indexation, either the panel could be invited to recommend that indexation be adopted; or in the unlikely event that the Panel were to disregard the request to consider indexation, the Council could nevertheless decide to adopt a scheme based on indexation, as the requirement is to have regard to the recommendations of the Panel, but not necessarily to accept their recommendations.

Savings would come from paying the IRP once every four years, although a higher payment might be necessary, so research into what other authorities who review only once every 4 years pay their panels is needed.

East Herts has an IRP of five Panel Members. Four Panel Members are paid at £500 per review, whilst the Chairman is paid at £1,000. There is a vacancy on the Panel, but on the assumption the vacancy would be filled, the costs of conducting a review are therefore £3,000 p.a at the present, plus travel expenses and the administration time of Officers.

A reduction in the frequency of reviews to once every four years could reduce this amount by £9,000 over four years, subject to deduction of any higher payment to the IRP Members.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

No consultation has taken place.

The public would likely prefer that the costs of administering reviews should follow a streamlined approach in the interests of minimising cost if there is no need to review a scheme of allowances in its entirety on an annual basis.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue	0	£3	£6	£6
Capital	0	0	0	0

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£3		£3

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	Reviews include allowances paid to carers of dependants. The needs of those Members with dependants could change during the 4 years, but the current scheme does already permit an allowance to be paid to meet the costs of care in these circumstances.

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<p>Would bring the Council into line with other authorities' practice</p> <p>Would reduce administration time, as supporting the IRP is a time consuming exercise for Democratic Services</p> <p>Simplicity and certainty of indexed scheme of allowances</p>	<p>Fine-tuning of scheme of allowances would not take place in the interval between 4 yearly reviews, so any new arrangements such as new posts which might attract special responsibility allowances would require an interim arrangement to apply. This would for example be a decision by the Head of Finance and Property to determine such SRA.</p> <p>Fewer opportunities for Members and the public to consider and scrutinize the scheme of allowances and comment</p>

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Fewer meetings with IRP would reduce travel emissions.	None	Not applicable	Not applicable

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is a duty to have an IRP and there is a duty to have regard to the recommendations of the IRP.

### 3 Civic regalia

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Cllr Linda Haysey</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>James Ellis</b>

#### Description of Service:

Review civic regalia

Civic regalia comprise the following items and values:

#### Civic Regalia

Chairman's Chain and Pendant	£6,000
Spare Chairman's Chain and Pendant	£6,000
Vice-Chairman's Chain and Pendant	£4,400
Chairman's Consort Pendant	£630
Vice-Chairman's Consort Pendant	£630
Chairman Lady Pendant (Bow Brooch Bar)	£750

#### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

There is a spare Chairman's badge and chain worth £6,000 (due to the fact that in 2014 the Chairman's chain was believed to have been stolen, but was then found; in the intervening period, a new replica chain was purchased). The spare one could be sold.

A view could also be taken on whether there is a need for the entire list of the above items to be retained. If this is not necessary, some items could also be sold.

The convention of giving presentation items for "long service" awards to Members could be reviewed, and possibly substituted with less expensive tokens of appreciation. An illustration of the cost of such awards is the badge or pin given to Cllr Ruffles in 2016 which cost £1,228 plus VAT and carriage.

There is a cost in providing a badge to the outgoing Chairman of the Council of approximately £358 plus VAT and carriage. Not all councils give this type of gift. A lower cost gift could be given, or giving a gift could be dispensed with entirely.

There are costs in engraving the new Chairman's name onto the Chairman's chain links each civic year. The engraving costs approximately £50, and the courier costs approximately £150. The engraving is done by a specialist company, the nearest one (according to research by the Chairman's PA in 2019) being based in Birmingham. However, further research into whether a local provider could engrave the name could be carried out, saving

the courier fee.

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

No consultation has taken place, but providing symbols of office is a well-known tradition, supports identification of the office holder at events, and is expected by the community where an office is performed.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	0	0	0	0
Capital	£6	0	0	0

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£2		£2

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	None

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Recovering capital cost of redundant items</p> <p>Reducing repair costs if there are fewer items of civic regalia in circulation</p> <p>Achieving value for money on the civic regalia which is in use</p> <p>Reducing courier costs if a nearer provider can be located</p>	<p>Insured value of spare chain and pendant may not be recovered on the market</p> <p>Keeping a spare chain and pendant may mitigate cost of a future loss of the chain and pendant</p> <p>Ceasing to provide items of civic regalia to consorts could detract from their prominence at events, and reduce their sense of feeling recognised</p> <p>Cessation of past Chairman’s badge would deprive the Council of a means of expressing appreciation and deprive the outgoing Chairman of the gratification of</p>

having received a token of appreciation.

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Re-purposing the spare chain and pendant could save another purchaser buying a new item unnecessarily; costs of reduced couriating would potentially reduce carbon emissions from sending items a long distance by vehicle for repair	None	Not applicable.	Not applicable.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Provision of civic regalia is not a requirement in law.

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Economic Growth
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Jan Goodeve
<b>LT Lead:</b>	James Ellis

## 1 Land Charges and LLPG

### Description of Service:

**Land Charges** – to provide local authority searches as part of the conveyancing process, and to update and maintain the Land Charges Register.

**LLPG** – this is the main addressing database used by the majority of council services, and is the address database used by the Emergency Services.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

This is limited in terms of savings/income generation due to the following: -

- Land Charges fees are not allowed by law to be profit making, the council is therefore capped on a cost recovery basis.
- LLPG – no budget for this so N/A

Prior to COVID-19/lockdown the Land Charges service was heavily paper based but since working remotely the team have changed processes and practices which has reduced paper use dramatically, as the entire search process is now undertaken electronically from start to finish and the results emailed back to solicitors. The process itself takes longer to perform electronically, but there is a small saving in stationery costs.

Payment for searches prior to Covid-19 was split fairly evenly between cheques and electronic BACS payments. Since lockdown, payment by cheque has been replaced by card payments over the ICON portal, so there is a small potential saving in banking admin costs.

### Additional work/income for 2020/21

An unexpected 'bulk' order of searches by a Housing Association was received in July which has generated an additional **£60,000 – please see Revenue box below for 20/21.**

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Land Charges - customers are solicitors undertaking official (paid for) local authority searches, and personal search agents who inspect the Land Charges Register free of charge.

The service has to ensure that it abides by the Government's maximum 10 day turnaround time for official searches, and the monthly results are published on the council's website. The



service strives to achieve a turnaround time of within 5 working days whenever possible.

Access to the Land Charges Register for personal search agents must be allowed within a reasonable timeframe, which is generally considered to be similar to the official search turnaround time for each LA.

LLPG – the service is currently operating at Gold standard for its property database which it hopes to sustain. The LLPG is the corporate address database used by Land Charges, Street Naming and Numbering, Planning, Environmental Health, Electoral Services, Customer Services, and the shared Waste Services. It forms part of the UK’s National Land & Property Gazetteer (NLPG) which is used by the Emergency Services and is currently being rolled out to the NHS.

\*see below - one off Land Charges bulk order which we can’t guarantee will occur again in the following years.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue	£60*			
Capital				

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£266	£268	(£2)

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	NA
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	NA

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
N/A	

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)</b>			
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Economic Growth</b>	<b>Enabling Communities</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
N/A			

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Run within statutory constraints without much scope for savings generation.

## 1 Electoral Services: Canvass reform

### Description of Service: Electoral Services

The Electoral Registration Officer (EROs) is required by legislation to undertake an annual 'canvass' of all residential properties in the district, with a view to ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the electoral register in time for the publication of the revised register on 1 December each year.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Representation of the People (Annual Canvass) (Amendment) Regulations 2019 introduced a number of changes designed to streamline the annual canvass process, reduced the administrative burden on EROs and provide them with greater discretion to run a tailored canvass to suit their local area.

These changes include a national data matching process following which EROs may apply a light-touch canvass process to properties where all existing registered electors successfully match with DWP data ('Route 1'); discretion to use e-communications at certain stages of the canvass rather than printed and mailed forms; and the introduction of telephone canvassing for some properties as an alternative to the traditional door-knocking personal canvass.

Approximately 80% of East Herts residential addresses qualify as Route 1 properties. The Route 1 process requires the occupant to respond to the canvass communication only if there are changes to be made to the register information and no reminders are required.

It is proposed that the ERO will exercise his discretion to take advantage of the increased flexibility provided by the new canvass process and in particular to apply Route 1 to all qualifying properties and to utilise email communications/telephone canvassing as an alternative to printed forms/personal visits where permitted and where the necessary contact details are held.

The total cost to the authority of the Annual Canvass in 2019 was approximately £91,000. It is estimated that the proposed changes will result in savings in printing costs, postage (outward and reply-paid returns) and canvasser pay totalling £25,000.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The service currently meets all statutory requirements. At least one communication is sent to every household in the district annually in addition to correspondence with individual applicants, and numbers of complaints are very low.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	-	£25	£25	£25
Capital	-	-	-	-

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£122	Ad hoc (misc. register sales)	£122

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Lower cost whilst still meeting statutory requirements	The streamlined canvass process available for Route 1 properties does not provide for reminders to be sent to non-responding properties. However thorough monitoring on a national level throughout the testing process found that this should not have a significant detrimental effect on the accuracy or completeness of the electoral register.

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
The proposal will decrease the number of paper forms printed and distributed.	N/A	N/A.	The revised process makes increased use of e-communications and seeks to direct electors to the online response and registration channels as the preferred option.

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

All requirements of the Representation of the People Act 1983 and associated legislation will continue to be met.

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enabling Communities
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Geoff Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	James Ellis

## 1 Electoral Services: Postage

### Description of Service: Electoral Services

Communications with electors via the postal service.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Currently electoral services communications that are required to be sent to electors/residents by post, for example annual canvass forms and related communications, are mailed via Royal Mail 2<sup>nd</sup> class post. The service currently spends approximately £40,000 per year on postage.

Use of a lower cost provider (such as Whistl) instead of Royal Mail offers the potential for savings of up to 10% on this service, albeit at the cost of a slower service (colleagues at other local authorities report that delivery time can be extended from 2-3 days to up to one week).

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The service currently meets all statutory requirements. At least one communication is sent to every household in the district annually in addition to correspondence with individual applicants, and numbers of complaints are very low.

#### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	-	£4	£4	£4
Capital	-	-	-	-

#### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£122	Ad hoc (misc. register sales)	£122

#### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

--	--

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Lower cost whilst still meeting statutory requirements	<p>Longer delivery times may impact on customer satisfaction especially at key periods e.g. elections where forms must be returned by statutory deadlines.</p> <p>Longer delivery times may increase the likelihood of reminder forms needing to be issued, which would reduce the saving achieved.</p>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
N/A	N/A	If longer delivery times reduce return rate of forms, some potential electors may not be registered or may miss statutory deadlines e.g. for a postal or proxy vote for an election.	N/A

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

All requirements of the Representation of the People Act 1983 and associated legislation will continue to be met.

# 1 Electoral Services: Reminder invitations

Corporate Priority: Enter text here

Portfolio Holder:

LT Lead: James Ellis

## Description of Service: Electoral Services

When the Electoral Registration Officer (ERO) becomes aware (e.g. as a result of an entry on a canvass form or a personal contact) of a person who is resident in the district and may be eligible to register to vote but is not currently registered, the ERO must issue that person with an 'invitation to register' (ITR) and application form. If the person does not respond, either by returning the form or by registering online, up to two reminders must be sent and a personal visit made to encourage him/her to do so.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

E-mail communications are used wherever possible but over 50% of ITRs still require a paper form to be printed and posted.

At East Herts currently, the initial ITR form and (where required) the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> reminders are sent by post/email. If no response is received, a personal visit is then made by a canvasser and a further form (effectively a 3<sup>rd</sup> reminder) printed for this purpose.

In 2019/20, 2,171 2<sup>nd</sup> reminder ITRs were issued. There are currently 1,214 3<sup>rd</sup> reminder forms awaiting canvassers to undertake personal calls as part of the ongoing annual canvass.

With effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 it is proposed to discontinue generating 3<sup>rd</sup> reminder ITR forms and to undertake the required 'door knock' at the 2<sup>nd</sup> reminder stage. This will reduce both printing costs (of 3<sup>rd</sup> reminders) and postage costs (of 2<sup>nd</sup> reminders now being delivered by canvasser) totalling an estimated £2,000.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The service currently meets all statutory requirements. At least one communication is sent to every household in the district annually in addition to correspondence with individual applicants, and numbers of complaints are very low.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	-	£2,000	£2,000 continuing	£2,000 continuing
Capital	-	-	-	-

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£122,000	Ad hoc (misc. register sales)	£122,000

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Lower cost whilst still meeting statutory requirements	<p>Reducing the number of reminder invitations issued to the legal minimum may result in certain residents who are entitled to register to vote not doing so.</p> <p>Outside of the annual canvass, door-knocking of reminder ITRs is undertaken by core Electoral Services staff. Increasing the number of properties to be visited may impact on those staff's other duties.</p>

### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
The proposal will decrease the number of paper forms printed and distributed.	N/A	Reducing reminders may result in some potential electors not being registered.	N/A

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

All requirements of the Representation of the People Act 1983 and associated legislation will continue to be met.



# 1 Street Naming and Numbering

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enabling Communities
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Jan Goodeve
<b>LT Lead:</b>	James Ellis

## Description of Service:

**Street Naming and Numbering** – provides services primarily to developers and house builders in relation to construction of new roads/commercial development, construction of new buildings (commercial/residential), change of property name, and renaming existing streets.

**Street signs** – responsible for replacement of broken or damaged street nameplates.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

This is limited in terms of savings/income generation due to the following: -

- SNN – fees were revised on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018 as part of a benchmarking exercise across Hertfordshire and were increased by approximately 50% at that time. Fees are now increased each financial year using the council's agreed overall fee increase.
- Street signs – the service has only recently taken this over in January 2020 from Property. There is an annual budget (budget code LC101/1080/RZZ999) which the service will review next financial year to see what was spent in the previous financial year and whether there are any savings to be made. However, please note that 2020/21 is not a comparable year due to lockdown/COVID-19, and less traffic would naturally lead to fewer damaged street signs.

Prior to lockdown, fees for Street Naming and Numbering applications were mostly paid by cheque, however this has now been changed to a mix of card payments over the phone using the ICON portal along with a few BACS payments. Neither of these options are popular with the larger developers, who would all prefer us to resume taking payments by cheque once we are back in the office.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Timescales for SNN applications can vary hugely between around 2-4 weeks for a simple request such as a house name change, to 3-6 months for large applications containing multiple new streets and hundreds of new properties, as these require consultation with several different parties.

We have just been through the Tender process this year for our Street Nameplate contractor, and are confident that we have the best value for money for this service.

Damaged street signs are usually replaced in batches of 10-15 for economy reasons, and are normally erected within 3 months of being reported to us.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue	0	0	0	0
Capital				

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£266	£268	(£2)

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	N/A
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
N/A	

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Economic Growth</b>	<b>Enabling Communities</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
N/A			

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

1 **Operations Business Support:  
Training/Postage**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	N/A
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	N/A
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

**Description of Service:**

OPS001 3620 Training Budget – budget £6600  
OPS001 3572 Postage – budget £3000

**Training:** Officer training for Operations not including Parking but includes Hertford Theatre

**Postage:** Use of Royal Mail service for items not covered by DocMail

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

**Training** – Reduce budget by 10% = £660, transfer remaining budget to corporate training budget - business case to be used from service areas for future training  
Training is usually required for any new enforcement inspection or aboriculture related roles which require accreditations and specialist training i.e., enforcement, animal warden

**Postage** – The current budget covers the following items that DocMail does not provide as a service.

Unavailability of a budget would affect the following items:-

Frequency: WEEKLY

Parking Enforcement - Scratch Card Vouchers  
- Paper Permits for residents without Internet  
- Postal Penalty Charge Notice challenges (forwarded to Parking Contractor (APCOA in Uxbridge)  
- Cheques received through post – forwarded to Parking Contractor as above

Frequency: AS AND WHEN REQUIRED (In 2019/20 approx 12 new TPOs served)

Aboriculture - New TPO's served (sent Recorded Delivery) – legal requirement  
TPO's confirmation (sent Recorded Delivery) – legal requirement

Frequency: AS AND WHEN REQUIRED

Abandoned Vehicles Owner's Declaration Forms (form & cover letter generated by back office system (Mayrise) & DVLA Machine are sent by post. DVLA machine only notifies addresses (not emails) and owners have 7 days to remove vehicle. Letters have to go first class to allow for owners opportunity to move vehicles within the timeframe.

Therefore no savings are offered in this budget line.

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

N/A

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	6	6	6	6
Capital				

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
Training - 6	-	Training - 6*
Postage – 3	-	Postage - 3

\*Training will reduce to 5940 and transfer to central fund

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	N/A
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Saving in training budget without negatively impacting service provision.	

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
--------------------

N/A

# 1 Env Inspections

**Corporate Priority:** Enabling Communities  
**Portfolio Holder:** Eric Buckmaster & Cllr McAndrew  
**LT Lead:** Jess Khanom-Metaman

## Description of Service:

EN001 - Environmental Inspection

The budget comprises the salary cost of four enforcement and inspection officers who carry out contract compliance monitoring the leisure and grounds maintenance contract, fly-tipping enforcement and dog/animal control.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

We currently have an Enforcement and Inspections Officer on a fixed term contract until the end of March 2021. Due to pressures on for the service as a result of COVID, there has been a delay in restricting this team further. It will be necessary to continue with this post until at least March 2022 as it is key in the contract management of some high value contracts and to ensure that our high visibility front line services such as dealing with fly-tipping, grass cutting and play areas do not suffer.

From April 2022 we will look at absorbing the role of Service Development Officer – Parking into the Leisure & Environmental Enforcement Team offering a possible saving.

During 2022/23 we will look at amalgamating Planning Enforcement into this team to see if this could realise further saving.

## What do the public say?:

The service is well received by the community and gains some really positive feedback from its work around enviro-crime. Much of the teams work involves auditing the work of our large contracts and whilst the public may not see this they receive the benefit from having well maintained parks and open spaces, play equipment and leisure facilities. This work is essential in ensuring that we offer our customers best value

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£31*	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

\*This is an additional pressure in 2021 which will be reduced in the following years.

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£129*	£0	£129

\*salary cost for staff

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Not as yet
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
The proposal to streamline contract compliance across parking, grounds maintenance and leisure will allow greater flexibility and resilience in the service.	

### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
		A resilient resource in this area will support the contract performance monitoring on front faces series such as leisure and parks and open spaces.	

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

n/a

# 1 Parks & Open Space Rental

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Economic Growth
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Eric Buckmaster
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom- Metaman

**Description of Service:**  
PK001 – Parks and Open Spaces

The maintenance of parks and open spaces to a standard that attracts potential income opportunities from hire or rental.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Generate income from resources

The proposal is to tender a district wide contract to rent pitches to catering vendors on selected open spaces.

Colleagues in Asset Management have recently negotiated a contract with an ice cream vendor in Hartham Common. This resulted in a seasonal monthly license fee of £1,200 (April to October – 7 months), achieving an annual income of £8,400. This will also mean we can manage vendors and ensure they remove rubbish as part of contract.

It should be possible to tender a contract for a number of other open spaces. We might tender individual sites and perhaps offer a deal for exclusivity to one company on all sites.

It is estimated that an annual income of £15,000 is achievable across four key sites.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public are generally supportive of food vending in parks in neighbouring authorities. Our own limited experience of burger vans has not resulted in any concerns from the public.

The vendors are required to ensure any waste generated from their product does not result in littering.

This would be a joint exercise between Operations and Corporate Property combining expertise in licensing, contract tendering and open space management.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	0	-£8	-£15	-£20
Capital				

## CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
N/A		

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No, this will be completed once the details of a contract tender have been explored.
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<p>We have x4 destination parks that may be viable; Hartham Common, Grange Paddocks, Pishiobury Park, Southern Country Park and then also perhaps Presdales.</p> <p>Some of these sites are less busy than Hartham and so may achieve lower fees.</p> <p>There may be less administrative costs involved in a single contract with one vendor but this could attract a lower overall rate.</p> <p>Vendors would need to ensure that all vans are Covid 19 compliant. For example; signage to ensure customers are aware of how to queue and which way they should exit once they have paid and received their ice creams /food, card machines to encourage cashless transactions, hot water and sinks for employees to wash hands throughout the day.</p>	<p>From a public health perspective, there may be some concerns about supporting the sale of unhealthy products on Council owned land.</p> <p>Some modest revenue investment is required to create hard surface pads and electric points to avoid the necessity for vendors to run their diesel generators on site. It may be possible to transfer these costs to the successful vendor.</p>

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Vendors would run on electric whilst on site, not on diesel	Income to support costs of park maintenance. Supporting local business		



## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The licence relating to the hire charge is just consent for use of the land. The vendor must also apply for a street trading licence, link attached. A trading licence must be in place before the Council would allow use of the Council's land.

<https://www.gov.uk/street-trading-licence/east-hertfordshire/apply>

# 1 Litter and Dog Waste Bin (Removal)

Corporate Priority:	Enter text here
Portfolio Holder:	Cllrs Graham McAndrew & Eric Buckmaster
LT Lead:	Jess Khanom- Metaman

## Description of Service:

PK101 – Grounds Maintenance

Non statutory provision of dog waste and litter bins in parks and open spaces

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The proposal is to remove all dog waste and litter bins from open spaces combined with a heightened campaign to encourage residents to take their rubbish home.

Some park's trusts, woodlands and heritage sites adopt this strategy.

If all bins were removed and the Council relied upon visitors taking their rubbish away with them, the current cost of emptying, £95,000 could potentially be saved.

The initial cost of removal and disposal would be in the region of £25,000.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Parks where this has been adopted are largely heritage/countryside sites where visitors either pay to visit or have travelled some distance. The clientele are already invested in the wellbeing of the asset and less likely to drop litter.

Some large forest sites encourage visitors to "flick" dog waste away from the path rather than install dog waste bins but this is not feasible in the open parkland settings that our open spaces offer.

Customers request new dog bins where they feel there needs to be more in a park and usage of these bins is high with a good proportion of bins being near full when emptied.

A public consultation would be undertaken, however the removal of bins from parks and open spaces, based on the level of complaints when litter or dog fouling is perceived as a problem, is not likely to be popular.

## VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	0	-£70,*	-£95*	-£95*
Capital				

\*this is a saving not income

**CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£95		£95

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No, this will be completed once public consultation feedback has been received.
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<p>A heightened campaign to persuade residents to take their rubbish and dog waste home with them could help to engender “ownership” in their parks as valuable public assets.</p> <p>Dog waste bins can, during warm weather, emit unpleasant aromas. This issue would be removed.</p> <p>The government encourages the public to take more responsibility. Under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, enforcement powers have been extended and widened to help tackle problems such as the leaving of litter, dog fouling and a range of environmental crimes such as fly-tipping and graffiti.</p>	<p>Municipal/publicly owned sites would struggle to convert users to this way of thinking. Litter picking would thus need increasing dramatically. The current Covid situation where littering has greatly increased as new customers visit our parks has exemplified this.</p> <p>Current litter picking costs are £80,000 without accounting for the increased service provided to tackle this problem. It would not be unreasonable to expect this cost to increase by at least 50% if all bins were removed resulting in additional costs in excess of £40,000.</p> <p>Dog fouling whilst still problematic in East Herts, has been under a degree of control following campaigns over the last few years. The removal of dog waste bins would likely have a considerable impact on this. Our current contract does not include the removal of dog faeces other than near dog bins during waste collection and in play areas. The cost of introducing a new service to pick up dog waste would need to be assessed and costed.</p> <p>Greater resources may need to be invested in enforcement activity to issue Fixed Penalty Notices where visitors are not complying with the law on littering. Experience shows that extensive and focused resource is required to tackle littering problems effectively.</p>

	Removal of this level of value from the grounds maintenance contract would attract challenge by the contractor for their loss of income. This would be negotiable under the terms of the contract and not necessarily result in compensation. However, it would have an impact on the contractor's ability to maintain a flexible and proactive service.
--	--

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Reduced vehicle use	Reduced costs	Public consultation will allow resident feedback to be considered	Use of digital media through campaign

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There may be some impact of loss of income to the Grounds Maintenance contractor. This has not been accounted and would require significant negotiation.

Guidance is provided in the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/834331/pb11577b-cop-litter1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834331/pb11577b-cop-litter1.pdf)

1.1 The Environmental Protection Act 1990 imposes duties under section 89(1) and (2) on certain landowners and occupiers (referred to throughout as 'duty bodies' and described in detail at section

3.2) to keep specified land clear of litter and refuse, and on local authorities and the Secretary of State to keep clean public highways for which they are responsible.

The Code of Practice seeks to encourage duty bodies to maintain their land within acceptable cleanliness standards. The emphasis is on the consistent and appropriate management of an area to keep it clean, not on how often it is cleaned.

**11.6 Public open spaces**

11.6.1 This land use type includes a wide range of open spaces to which the public has access. Sites include parks, picnic sites, and municipal cemeteries.

11.6.2 Public open spaces experience varying levels of patronage, often determined by their location or national/regional reputation. As an example, public open spaces located in intensely used zones should be managed closely as they will be subject to the same fluctuations in pedestrian, and in some cases, vehicular, flows, as the surrounding area. The same rule should be used for the other zones. Some hotspots in the less intensely used open spaces, such as car parks or information points, should be zoned as higher intensity zones in order to manage the likely fluctuations in littering appropriately.

# 1 Litter & Dog Waste Bins (Combine)

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enter text here
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Cllrs Graham McAndrew &amp; Eric Buckmaster</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Jess Khanom- Metaman</b>

## Description of Service:

PK101 – Grounds Maintenance

Non statutory provision of dog waste and litter bins in parks and open spaces

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The proposal is to rationalise the provision of bins in order to reduce the number of bins and frequency of emptying by replacing some or all litter and dog bins with dual waste bins allowing the contractor to collect and dispose of the waste in one operation.

We currently provide 725 dog waste and litter bins across the district. It may be feasible to remove 20% of our dog bins through rationalisation and upgrading nearby litter bins to larger capacity bins into which residents would be encouraged to deposit dog waste. The cost saving of such a reduction would be £19,000.

Further savings might be achieved by combining litter and dog waste collections into one activity, no longer separating dog waste and litter. The contract would likely offer a reduced rate. If costs could be reduced by 10% through this, the saving would be in the region of £10,000.

Assuming 20% of dog bins can be removed there would be a need to replace a number of litter bins with large capacity, dual purpose models. Ideally this would be all bins but given that revenue budgets will cover the replacement of some bins as they wear out and some will need to remain as dog waste bins, it would be reasonable to do this in a phased manner over a number of years. It is proposed that a maximum of £10,000 it allocated to a bin replacement programme per annum.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Consultation will need to be undertaken to establish whether customers would still be happy to use dual waste bins and whether there is any scope for removing all bins. There is opportunity to consult as part of the proposed Waste & Recycling consultation.

Dog fouling whilst still problematic in East Herts, has been under a degree of control following campaigns over the last few years. The removal of dog waste bins may have a negative impact on this but it is expected that residents can be convinced of the cost saving benefits of putting dog waste into dual waste receptacles. Our current contract does not include the removal of dog faeces other than near dog bins during waste collection and in play areas.

Other local authorities have introduced some dual dog waste and litter bins without significant adverse reaction.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue	0	-£29	-£29	-£29
Capital		£10	£10	£10

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£95	0	£95

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No, this will be completed once public consultation feedback has been received.
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
Some auditing already undertaken, this needs to be further surveyed and analysed to assess the potential for reducing the number of bins based upon current data (full, ½ full, ¼ empty) from collections, changing bin sizes, introducing dual use (dog waste and litter). The disposal stream needs to be explored in more detail to establish whether it may cost more to dispose of dog waste with litter but indications are that this is not the case.	Need to recognise that each park has different characteristic, eg. Pishiobury Park is predominantly visited by dog walkers and less so by groups picnicking or drinking in the evenings, it therefore has not needed many litter bins but has more dog bins. Hartham litter problems currently very bad, bins probably need to be more numerous and/or larger, Southern Country Park may have more litter bins than needed or for them to be located nearer to the main activity areas.

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Reduced vehicle use by combining dog and waste emptying	Reduced costs	Public consultation will allow resident feedback to be considered	

## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Guidance is provided in the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse  
Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/834331/pb11577b-cop-litter1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834331/pb11577b-cop-litter1.pdf)

1.1 The Environmental Protection Act 1990 imposes duties under section 89(1) and (2) on certain landowners and occupiers (referred to throughout as 'duty bodies' and described in detail at section

3.2) to keep specified land clear of litter and refuse, and on local authorities and the Secretary of State to keep clean public highways for which they are responsible.

The Code of Practice seeks to encourage duty bodies to maintain their land within acceptable cleanliness standards. The emphasis is on the consistent and appropriate management of an area to keep it clean, not on how often it is cleaned.

### 11.6 Public open spaces

11.6.1 This land use type includes a wide range of open spaces to which the public has access. Sites include parks, picnic sites, and municipal cemeteries.

11.6.2 Public open spaces experience varying levels of patronage, often determined by their location or national/regional reputation. As an example, public open spaces located in intensely used zones should be managed closely as they will be subject to the same fluctuations in pedestrian, and in some cases, vehicular, flows, as the surrounding area. The same rule should be used for the other zones. Some hotspots in the less intensely used open spaces, such as car parks or information points, should be zoned as higher intensity zones in order to manage the likely fluctuations in littering appropriately.

# 1 Allotment Fee Charges

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enabling Communities
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllrs Graham McAndrew & Eric Buckmaster
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

**Description of Service:**  
OPS 7 – Allotments

Allotment Rental on EHC owned land

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The proposal is to consider an increase of rental for allotment plots owned by the council. The council owns two allotment sites.

**Norwood Close** (8 plots) has recently had a new water trough installed and currently awaits connection by Affinity Water.

**West Street** (35 plots) has a water trough in the middle of the site.

Proposals for West Street & Norwood Close considers breaking up larger plots into 25m2 as and when they become available.

East Herts have one of the lowest charges for an allotment plot @ £4.00 per 25m2 (pole).

Authority	Cost per 25m2		Concessions
East Herts	£4.00 (with water)	Per year	None
Welwyn Hatfield	£7.06 (without water) £11.60 (with water)	Per year	Yes
North Herts	£14.50 (not specified)	Per year	Yes
Broxbourne	£5.00 (not specified)	Per year	Yes
Bishop's Stortford Town Council	£5.90 (not specified)	Per year	Yes
Hertford Town Council	£5.10 (not specified)	Per year	Not known

Some LA charges are likely to include access to onsite facilities such as toilets, water points, and communal shed for key deposits etc.

**Norwood Close** If the charge per m2 were increased to £8.00 per 25m2 this could potentially double the yearly income on both sites which both now have access to water.

**West Street** If plots were broken into 25m2 areas - this could increase the number of plots from the current 43 to 215 plots generating additional income in future years

Splitting larger sites up would increase admin (invoicing) but would negate against the need for issuing warning letters. An administration charge could be considered where some authorities charge £25 for a new application set up fee.

3 large plots which have become available at the moment could be split into 12 plots each of 25m2 and let at a 'new' rate.

The two sites are monitored by officers 4 times per year. Officers consider that West Street, in particular, is not being kept to an acceptable standard and not meeting its full potential. This is likely due to reduced monitoring but where shortened notice periods together with inviting a local volunteer as a site representative to oversee to gain a benefit from the council in return (Broxbourne tenancy is free for this role) could help to improve the situation.



Alternatively, the Council could transfer this responsibility to the towns and parishes.

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Historically there has always been a long waiting list for allotment rental. In recent months, new applications have increased by 337% compared to that of last year.

Current plot holders advise they wish to see more water facilities at West Street where transporting water from the trough is arduous due to distance.

Evidence shows that not all are using the full area of their plot; this could be challenged and split up to offer up additional plots.

Some new applicants have been put off by the state of the plot they are to take over but where black plastic sacks could be used while vacant to encourage taking on larger plots.

An increase in a plot fee is likely to help incentivise holders to maintain standards. Those who leave plots to degrade are sent notifications which can take a long period of time depriving others the opportunity keen to maintain it.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue	0	-£0.5	-£0.5	-£0.5
Capital	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
0.95	0.9	0.05

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Yet to be completed.
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	Unknown at this stage.

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fee increase would be timely with the imminent switch on of the Water facility in Norwood Close</li> <li>• Introduces a stronger perception by plot holders to maintain plot standards</li> <li>• Reduce the waiting list currently at an average of 18 months</li> <li>• Provide opportunities for those wishing to manage a small plot</li> <li>• Breaking up odd shaped plots making them more attractive to manage</li> <li>• Breaking the current 3 vacant plots would increase revenue immediately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fee increase may affect the ability of a person currently with a plot to pay due to redundancy, unemployment</li> </ul>

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
		Increase opportunities for people supporting physical and mental health and wellbeing	

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None

# 1 Playgrounds

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Enabling Communities</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Cllr Eric Buckmaster</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Jess Khanom-Metaman</b>

## Description of Service:

PK102 - Playgrounds

There are 63 play areas managed by EHC.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The proposal seeks to permanently close 10% (six) of play areas. The budget for playground inspections is approximately £100,000, broadly speaking this will provide a £10,000 saving. At this stage the proposal does not include any exit costs with the contractor for reducing the inspection work by 10%.

Members will need to agree the criteria for which play areas will be eligible for closure.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

This is highly likely to be unpopular and create complaints in local wards.

Whilst a neighbouring authority; North Herts, reduced spending by rationalising their play offer in 2018, this was achieved by transferring ownership of some play areas to Parish Councils and as part of a wider investment programme. Play areas in rural areas are already in the ownership of Parish Councils in East Herts and therefore unlikely to take on EHC play areas.

East Herts has maintained a good record of safety across its play areas.

## VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue		£5	£10	£10
Capital				

## CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£103		

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Not as yet
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Small budget saving</li><li>• Offsets inspection pressure for client team monitoring</li><li>• Closure is “safer” than reducing health and safety inspection frequency.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reputational damage and complaints</li><li>• Reduces the Council’s offer to young people</li><li>• Cost of removing equipment and returning site to grass, approximately £5,000 to £10,000 per play area.</li></ul>

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
		This is a reduction in the offer to communities	

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Some exit implications with grounds contractor will need to be investigated further

# 1 Leisure Provision

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enabling Communities
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Eric Buckmaster
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

**Description of Service:**  
LS101

Leisure Centres operated by Everyone Active

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

Subject to no further delays and the outcome of the Ward Freman investment discussions. Following the capital investment in leisure centres it is anticipated that income received by the Council will be approx. £45,000 per annum.

**What do the public say?:**  
Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community. Consultation has already taken place as part of planning submissions.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue		£100*	£100	-£404**
Capital				

\*year 2 contract fee to SLM increases by £100k

\*\*subsidy removed and £45k income to Council

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£468	0	£468

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	N/A
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	M/A

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
N/A	N/A

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

# 1 Theatre and Café /Bar

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enabling communities
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Eric Buckmaster
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

## Description of Service:

OPS 29-29

HT101 HERTFORD THEATRE

HT102 HERTFORD THEATRE CAFÉ

Hertford Theatre and Café is currently offering a limited service of cinema, hiring space and café within a COVID-secure environment.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

There is an operational efficiency that has been approved in principle by LT to reduce staffing numbers following the end of the furlough scheme and maintaining a COVID-secure environment. This efficiency seeks to save approx. £113,000

2020/21 budget (Jan – March) £34,000

2021/22 budget (April to July 2021): £79,000

Final costs will differ following HR processes of slotting staff into roles/redundancies.

A further proposal for member consideration is to close the Theatre prior to August which is when it is due to close for construction to start (subject to planning a review of business case). This will provide a salary saving of approx. £8500

Due to a COVID-secure environment and previous closure, income has significant reduced. This proposal aims to reduce expenditure to mitigate some of this however against the base budget these are not savings (as the usual income generated to offset expenditure is not being achieved). The full impact of a full closure is yet to be determined.

Should the capital project complete within its current timeline with no additional funding requirements, the income in 2023/24 will provide a contribution to the Council of approx. £50,000 (income from September 2023 to March 2024).

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The Hertford Theatre is a popular venue with strong support from users. Though it may be an unpopular decision to close earlier than anticipated the participation levels are extremely low. In addition, when the theatre was closed under government instruction earlier this year the users continued to engage with HT virtually, the plan would be to keep on strong online presence of engagement and explore the potential for a Xmas show in 2022.

## VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue		£87	£87*	-£50
Capital				

\*further work to be carried out on costs during closure period

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
1,278	1,298	<b>-£20</b>

\*budget as approved by Council (COVID impacts this significantly in reality).

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No yet
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	Not known as yet

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
Reduces further deficit to Council as a result of COVID, theatre is due to close anyway as a result of the construction programme (subject to planning permission and a review of the business plan).	Though the decision may be unpopular in terms of reputation, public consultation will determine whether the public “understand” the reasons and continue to support the Theatres work.

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Economic Growth</b>	<b>Enabling Communities</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
Reducing energy costs of building whilst closed			A strong social media and online will be present during the closure.

### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

HR law in term of redundancies will be followed. Some contracts with hirers will need to be amended/compensated.



# 1 Markets

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Economic Growth
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Jan Goodeve
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

**Description of Service:**  
EC101 – Markets

Street trading service and final funding to BTC

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

In 2018, the Council agreed to disband the Hertford and Ware market and transfer the market rights for Bishop’s Stortford to BSTC. There are no further savings proposed in this area.

**What do the public say?:**  
Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

N/A

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Capital				

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
27	28	-1

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	N/A
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
N/A	N/A

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

N/A

# 1 Organic Waste Collection Services OPS12

## Description of Service:

Non statutory collection of mixed food and garden waste in 240l wheeled bins from all houses in the district (Brown bin collection).

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The proposal is for the cessation of the non-statutory service, with the offer of an opt-in chargeable garden waste collection service for those residents who wish to dispose of garden waste at the kerbside. The charge proposed is £45 per bin per annum.

Alternative free options will remain such as home composting or taking garden waste to the household waste recycling centres. A separate food waste collection is not included in this proposal, residents will be directed to place their food waste in their residual waste bins or use the free options available for disposing such waste. Campaigns on minimising food waste will also be promoted.

The proposal assumes the service will start in April 20/21. In reality with a decision in March this will not be feasible and therefore the savings figure will be reduced. Some activities could be carried out at risk including website development and marketing and comms prep. The proposal also assumes we will use the Digital Peanut platform for card and direct debit payments which is the platform Urbaser manage for North Herts.

It should be noted that a reduction in garden waste collected will lead to a reduction in the recycling rate of the Council. AFM implications have not been incorporated in these costs as there is uncertainty over this funding.

The project will require some initial one off costs these include (all subject to final negotiations): costings below are based on the North Herts uptake rate of 48%

Website Development	9000
Transaction Costs	20,000
IT system round changes	5,000
Temp Staff	18,000
Permits	40,364
Collection costs	808,020
<b>Total</b>	<b>900,384</b>
Current Cost of service	1,062,830
48% households	29807
Gross income	1,341,317
Net income	540,933
<b>Net reduction in cost in Year 1</b>	<b>703,379</b>
<u>Year 2</u>	
Total Cost	768,384

<b>Net reduction in cost</b>	<b>735,379</b>
------------------------------	----------------

No additional resource is proposed for communication and publicity, this will be funded from existing budgets by reducing other service promotional work and information such as calendars and bin hangers.

Figures are subject to final negotiations with contractor. The cost of a potential uplift in residual waste and collection round has not be included as yet. This is being discussed with the contractor.

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

A public consultation will be undertaken, however the introduction of chargeable services, where services have previously been free of charge, are not popular and are unlikely to generate support at public consultation.

Evidence from neighbouring authorities in Hertfordshire indicates that participation is likely to be between 40% and 50% of all households.

The shared service in North Hertfordshire operates a chargeable garden waste collection and currently has 48% participation.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue	£0	<b>£703*</b>	<b>£735</b>	<b>£735</b>
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

\*net reduction in costs if a full year's service is achieved

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£1,063	£0	£1,063

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No, this will be completed once public consultation feedback has been received.
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs incurred based on usage only</li> <li>Reduced deficit to Council and income</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputational risks, initially unpopular with residents</li> </ul>

<p>generation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents of flats without gardens are not subsidising the service for others through Council tax.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May impact on voting habits of some residents</li> <li>Some initial service disruption while new service beds in is likely</li> <li>Additional administrative resource required</li> <li>Small risk of initial increase in garden waste fly tipping</li> <li>Increased use of household waste recycling centres likely</li> <li>Directing food waste to landfill</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Directing food waste to landfill	Internal facing income	Public consultation will allow resident feedback to be considered	Payments can be self-serve through online web portal

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Council must provide collections of food waste therefore residents will be instructed to place food waste in residual waste bins as a result of the mixed food and garden waste service cessation.

The legislative framework exists for charging for garden waste collections from households.

The Government’s new waste strategy is anticipated to require the future separate collection of food waste by 2023. The introduction of a weekly food waste service will incur an additional financial pressure of approx. £1m when introduced.

A Contract Variation would be required for the Waste and Street Cleansing contract.

# 1 Provision of Public Conveniences

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enabling Communities
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Graham McAndrew
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom- Metaman

## Description of Service:

Provision of public conveniences in Buntingford and Community Toilet Scheme in major towns.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The proposal is for the cessation of the provision of public conveniences in Buntingford and the cessation of the Community Toilet Scheme. At the current time EHC maintains only one facility which is in Buntingford. All other facilities previously maintained by EHC have either been closed or transferred to a third party.

The Community Toilet Scheme has been operating for over 12 years. There is little public awareness of the scheme and the scheme does not provide improved coverage of toilet provision in the district over and above what is normally available.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Complaints have been received regarding the condition of the toilet in Buntingford. Its condition is such that some refurbishment work is needed and therefore there is a Capital requirement estimated between £10k-£20k to keep the toilets open.

Although no approaches have been made the Operations Team would explore opportunities for the transfer of responsibility for Buntingford Toilet.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	-£18	-£18	-£18
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£18	£0	£18

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**Has an EQIA been completed?**  
(If yes, date to be added)

No, this will be completed should the proposal be taken forward.

<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	The closure of Buntingford would likely impact on elderly and disabled visitors to the town as one of the primary users of the facilities.
--	--

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs removed</li> <li>Avoidance of Capital spend</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initially unpopular with some users</li> </ul>

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Facility is old in design with no consideration of sustainable design	Negligible impact	The provision of toilets is seen as necessary by some users. However toilets are not provided on all towns.	N/A

### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The provision of public toilets is non-statutory.

Community Toilet Scheme contractual arrangements will require review.

Any transfer of the Buntingford facility would require legal to draft an agreement.

A contract variation would be required for the waste and street cleansing contract.

## OPS14 Waste Collection – Domestic Service

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Sustainability
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr McAndrew
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

### Description of Service:

Fortnightly residual waste collection from households and fortnightly or weekly residual waste collection from flats.

On request, chargeable bulky waste collection service.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

No recommendations for savings for residual waste collections.

Bulky waste collection services will be reviewed as part of a separate report to Executive due later this year.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

N/A

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital				

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£1,480,000	£80,000	£1,400,000

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A



KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
N/A	N/A

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Collection of residual household waste is a statutory function.

**OPS15 Waste Collection –  
Commercial Service**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Sustainability
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr McAndrew
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

**Description of Service:**

On request, chargeable residual waste collection for businesses.

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

Commercial waste collection services will be reviewed as part of a separate report to Executive due later this year.

The full impact Covid 19 on the customer base is yet to be determined.

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

N/A

**VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)**

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital				

**CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£420	£695	- £275

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
N/A	N/A

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Collection of commercial waste can be made at a reasonable charge.

## OPS16 Waste Collection – Clinical Service

**Corporate Priority:** Enter text here  
**Portfolio Holder:**  
**LT Lead:**

### Description of Service:

On request offensive waste and clinical waste collection for households.

On request, chargeable offensive waste and clinical waste collection for businesses.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

None

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

N/A

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital				

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£60,000	£50,000	£10,000

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
N/A	N/A

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Collection of clinical waste can be made at a reasonable charge.

## OPS17 Street Cleansing Service

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enabling Communities
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Graham McAndrew
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

### Description of Service:

Street sweeping and litter picking on the public highway. Emptying of litter bins of the public highway.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

None – the performance of street cleansing is being closely monitored, at this stage savings are not proposed.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

N/A

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital				

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£675,000	£50,000	£10,000

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
N/A	N/A

--	--

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

## OPS18 Recycling Service

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Sustainability
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Graham McAndrew
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

### Description of Service:

Haulage and processing on mixed dry recycling and separated paper.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

None. Proposals to increase income through recycling were included in the 2020/21 budget however due to COVID service priorities have shifted and this is unlikely to be achieved for 2020/21.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

N/A

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital				

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£810	£2,107	£1,297

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
----------	----------



N/A	N/A
-----	-----

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Contracts are procured under OJEU tendering requirements.

# Parking income proposals

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Economic Growth
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Graham McAndrew
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Jess Khanom-Metaman

## Description of Service:

Various changes for the parking service in our car parks and limited waiting bays in three main town centres.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

1. Increase all parking tariffs by 10% (where practicable)
2. Remove free parking option in all car parks except Grange Paddocks B and C which serves Grange Paddocks leisure centre
3. Introduce evening charging up to 8pm in three main towns
4. Introduce Sunday and Bank Holiday charging
5. Charge blue badge holders to park in our car parks
6. Introduce on-street charging in town centre limited waiting bays

### 1. Tariff increase

Since 2010 car park charges have been frozen, and in many cases reduced. During this period the continued annual rise in inflation and the increase of VAT from 17.5% to 20% in 2011 has eroded the value of our car park charges.

### 2. Free parking period

The majority of car parks in East Herts offer a 30 minute free parking period which was initially introduced to encourage visitors to the town and help the local economy. Studies suggest that offering brief free parking periods is counterproductive and does not encourage browsing in shops or using local hospitality facilities.

Buntingford car park offers a free 90 minute period and Stanstead Abbots car park is sponsored by a local company so the entire car park is free to members of the public.

### 3. Evening and overnight charging

Town centres have evolved over time and as well as offering a shopping experience during the day, various pubs, bars and restaurants offer services which support the evening economy. Currently, our car parks offer free parking after 18:30 which is not consistent with the principal "User pays for services used"

### 4. Sunday & Bank Holiday charging

In the late 80s when Monday to Saturday tariff was introduced in our car parks, most shops and businesses were closed on Sundays and Bank Holidays and therefore no need for a car parking service. In the past forty years things have moved on and habits have changed. Sunday is now the second busiest shopping day of the week in our towns and many people choose to visit to shop, eat and drink.

### 5. Blue badge charging

The national blue badge scheme does not provide any concessions for holders within off-street car parks. The principal of providing concessions for blue badge holders is about providing access and has no bearing on the ability to pay.

Currently, any vehicle displaying a valid blue badge may park in East Herts car park free of charge without time limit.

## 6. On-street charging

The proposal is to introduce charging using the pay by phone option in all limited waiting parking bays located in town centres.

The convenient location of these limited waiting bays means that they are highly sought after by visitors to our towns. Currently, it is free to park in these bays for a maximum period of 30 minutes with no return within 1 hour.

Enforcement for these bays cannot be carried out as regularly as required due to limited resources and the very short period of parking allowed. It is highly likely that most users of these bays currently park for longer than the maximum period and rarely receive penalties.

It is proposed that vehicles parking in these bays Monday to Saturday 9am to 5pm will pay for the privilege.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Any increase to parking tariffs or tightening of parking restrictions will result in objections and complaints from stakeholders and residents.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue				
1. Tariff			-£260	-£260
2. FREE			-£55	-£55
3. Evening			-£60	-£60
4. Sunday			-£56	-£56
5. Blue badge			-£40	-£40
6. On street			-£80	-£80
Capital	£0 (See below)	£0	£0	£0

£67,000 - TRO, machine programming, tariff upgrade, PbP programming.

\*\*Above costs would apply to proposals 1-5. If one, some or all of these proposals are implemented at the same time £67,000 will be total expenditure. Its is therefore more economical to implement a number of changes within the same TRO and programming changes.

For proposal 6 a different TRO is required which will cost £10,000

All income is based on performance on August 2020 transaction levels.

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
658	3600*	-2948

\*budgeted, does not reflect impact of COVID on car parking

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	To be completed following TRO consultation
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

--	--

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• User pays for service received (ALL)</li> <li>• Encourage change in travel behavior by seeking to reduce private vehicle use. (ALL)</li> <li>• Increased turnover of vehicles (on-street charging)</li> <li>• Reduced enforcement process (on-street charging)</li> <li>• Better management information (on-street charging &amp; removal of free period)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of reputational damage to the council during the formal consultation process linked to the expected number of objections from all stakeholders (ALL)</li> <li>• Negative impact on local residents with no access to private parking spaces who use car park in the current free periods (Sunday &amp; Evening charging)</li> <li>• Potential for displacement of vehicles from car parks to locations which are unrestricted on Sunday and/or evenings which may result in traffic congestion. (Blue badge, Sunday &amp; Evening charging)</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Encourages other sustainable transport modes	Internal income	Public consultations are part of the statutory TRO process	Parking machines and 'pay by phone' options.

## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The statutory legal process required in order to introduce one, some or all of these changes will take approximately 18 months.

# 1 Planning Service

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Economic Growth</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Linda Haysey and Jan Goodeve</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Sara Saunders</b>

## Description of Service:

Planning PL001

The Planning Service provides a combination of complimentary statutory and non-statutory planning functions as the Local Planning Authority for East Herts.

Statutory services include:

- The responsibility for the preparation, monitoring and review of the District Plan and associated planning documents;
- Overseeing the delivery of Neighbourhood Plans;
- The determination of planning applications
- Designation of Conservation Areas

Non statutory services include:

- Planning enforcement;
- Master planning and the preparation of non-statutory planning documents
- Provision of specialist advice
- Strategic planning
- Pre application advice

In addition, the service pays for historic environment, ecology and monitoring services from Hertfordshire County Council in order to support the statutory planning functions.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

As part of delivering the above planning functions the Council introduced a new service structure in 2018 which includes Planning Policy, Development Management, Enforcement, Conservation and Planning Support. This structure was introduced to support the implementation of the District Plan and delivery of a number of strategic sites including Gilston. There are currently 51 members of staff in the service (including agency staff) and 9 vacancies (which are covered by agency staff).

However, the structure has never been fully implemented and a number of posts have been difficult to recruit to. As a result, the service has employed a number of planners on an agency basis in order to deliver its statutory and non-statutory functions and the commitments set out in the District Plan.

Given that the current structure has not been successfully implemented, it is under review in order to provide more resilience, create more opportunities to train and develop staff and better manage a range of complex and demanding planning issues. The review is anticipated to be completed over the next six months.

The current salary budget for 2020/2021 is £2,062,360

The forecast for agency staff in 2020/2021 is £460,000

The cost of agency staff for 2019/2020 was £426,285 and the cost of agency staff for 2018/2019 was £ 500,355

Initial work on the restructure indicates that there could be a possible saving of up to £30,000 from the salary budget (this also assumes that Planning will directly pay for Trainees and Apprenticeships in the future in line with the option to remove the central Apprenticeship Salary Budget). However, this needs to be worked through in greater detail as the proposals are developed. Further consideration needs to be given to the arrangements for the planning support team and delivering the proposals for Gilston which forms part of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town. This will also include operational arrangements for planning enforcement.

Alongside the restructure, a number of operational improvements are being identified including an update to the pre application service and fees to better reflect actual costs and officer time, an update of the policy for planning enforcement and triage process, and review of planning performance agreements.

It will take time to put the new structure in place and fully recruit into the new posts, and therefore any savings may not be fully realised until 2021/2022.

In addition to this, the Planning White Paper on reforms to the planning system needs to be taken into consideration before any savings are agreed albeit that they are at an early stage and will be subject to change. The reforms which are out to consultation propose radical reform to streamline and modernise the planning process; improve outcomes on design and sustainability; reform developer contributions; and ensure more land is available for development where it is needed.

The Government has indicated in the White Paper that the cost of operating the new planning system should be principally funded by the beneficiaries of planning gain – landowners and developers – rather than the national or local taxpayer. Currently, the cost of development management activities by local planning authorities (LPA) is to a large extent covered by planning fees (although the current fee structure does mean that the cost of processing some applications can be significantly greater than their individual fee). However, the cost of preparing Local Plans is now largely funded from the LPAs own resources.

If a new approach to development contributions is implemented, it is being suggested in the White Paper that a proportion of the income should be earmarked to LPAs to cover their overall planning costs, including the preparation and review of Local Plans and design codes and enforcement activities.

This means that there will potentially be cost savings for the Council in the future but it is currently too early to say when these savings could be realised. Any savings will also need to take account of the requirement that reform is accompanied by a significant enhancement in digital and geospatial capability across the planning sector to support high quality new digital Local Plans and digitally enabled decision-making.

**What do the public say?:**

Planning is an open and transparent service which can attract a significant amount of public interest, and planning decisions can generate a number of complex complaints.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue		Up to 30*	Up to 30*	Up to 30*
Capital				

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£2,333		£2,333

\*Subject to further detail and costings on the restructuring proposals and implementation.

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in agency costs.</li> <li>• Responsive and customer focused structure.</li> <li>• Opportunity to improve internal processes and procedures.</li> <li>• Improvements to overall efficiency and communications.</li> <li>• More customer focused.</li> <li>• Continuation of statutory planning services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable to recruit leading to continuation of agency costs and negative impact on the overall resilience of the service to effectively manage workloads, competing challenges and complex issues.</li> <li>• Less able to effectively support residents and communities in the planning process.</li> <li>• Could impact on meeting statutory requirements and targets.</li> </ul>

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT** (please colour code RAG)

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Continues to support sustainable development in line with the District Plan.	Continues to support the economic growth of the district.	Continues to engage with residents and communities in an open and transparent way.	Operational improvements to enhance the digital capacity of the service.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**



**1 Planning Service  
Microfiche Digitisation**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Jan Goodeve</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Sara Saunders</b>

**Description of Service:**

Digitisation of approximately 400,000 historic microfiche planning application files. The contract also includes an on demand retrieval service for any files that maybe required.

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

The cost on a monthly basis is approximately £4,110. This includes a retrieval fee.

The budget for 2020/2021 is £40,800

The contract is due to end on the 31/03/2023 but all financial contributions cease on 31/03/2021. Once all the historic microfiche files have been digitalised, the archive service will no longer be needed moving forward. However, some internal IT resource will be required in order to link the digital files to IDOX.

All new planning application files are now digital.

**What do the public say?:**

Digital files can be made available on request if they are not on the Council's online planning application system.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue		£41	£41	£41
Capital				

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£40,800		£40,800

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full digitisation of historic planning application files.</li> </ul>	

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Smaller environmental impact if we don't need actual storage and physical transfer/ transport of files	Limited impact	Limited impact – residents still able to access documents	Digital solution instead of manual storage

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

# 1 Planning Advertising of Planning Applications

## Description of Service:

PBC1

PL001 3310 Advertising and Publicity

There is a statutory requirement in the 2015 Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order that certain planning applications need to be published in a newspaper rather than being less prescriptive. In accordance with this requirement, the Council advertises all planning applications for Listed Buildings, conservation areas and major developments in the local press.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

It is widely recognised that the requirements set out for advertising certain types of planning applications are outdated and in terms of how people access and consume information about their local area.

The current budget for advertising and publicity for 2020/2021 is £44,000.

The Hertfordshire Mercury charges £16.20 per cm/column and the Bishops Stortford Independent £6.00 per cm/column.

The actual spend for 2019/2020 was £39,336.00

Under the COVID Regulations, the Government has temporarily amended the planning regulations to say that Local Planning Authorities can use digital media to publicise applications that required wider public consultation rather than local press.

Whilst this is for a temporary period, there is a possibility that it may be continued and could be picked up as part of the wider reforms to the planning system.

The proposal is to stop advertising the smaller applications in the local press, and retain a small budget for advertising more controversial applications. This would generate a £30k saving.

Any cost savings are based on the Government continuing with this change to the regulations.

## What do the public say?:

Planning is already an open and transparent service and all applications are listed and viewable on the Councils Website.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue		30*	30*	30*
Capital				

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:

\* Subject to permanent changes in legislation by the Government.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning applications are already listed and viewable on the website. This would allow greater use of the website and other social media challenges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could be open to criticism from a small proportion of the public.</li> <li>Possible challenges to the planning process subject to adherence to the necessarily regulations.</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Limited impact	Reduced income to local newspapers who rely on this. However they shouldn't be over reliant on council advertising budgets	Potential opportunity to reach and inform a wider cross section of the community.	Enables greater use of the Council's website and social media challenges.

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Minimal - subject to appropriate changes to the regulations and compliance.

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Economic Growth
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Jan Goodeve
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Sara Saunders

## 1 Planning Service

### Description of Service:

#### PBC3 PL101 Development Management

The development management team are responsible for validating planning and determining considering planning applications, taking enforcement action where breaches of planning control have occurred, administering the appeals process and providing information and advice about the planning system in general. A pre application service is provided along with a duty planning officer service.

On an annual basis, the service deals with around 2,600 planning applications, 170 appeals, 50 major applications and over 400 enforcement cases. Case officers typically have around 40 planning applications on hand at any one time and on annual basis can deal with between 180 and 250 applications a year. Case officers also manage pre application advice.

The government set specific targets for meetings planning application deadlines with specific sanctions if they fail to be met on a consistent basis.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The service charge fees for planning applications and other types of related applications with fees being set at a national level. Fees are also charged at a local level for pre application advice and other work related to the implementation of the District Plan such as site specific SPDs and masterplanning activity. The service also agrees a number of planning performance agreements

Alongside the restructure of the planning service, there needs to be an increased focus on cost recovery and income to better manage the relationship between the cost of the service and the charges. There is also scope to improve the efficiency of system and workflow. Operational improvements include:

- A update to the pre application service and fees to better reflect actual costs and officer time;
- A review of planning performance agreements;
- An update to the policy for planning enforcement and triage process;

### What do the public say?:

Planning is an open and transparent service which can attract a significant amount of public interest, and planning decisions can generate a number of complex complaints.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	0	0	0	0
Capital				

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£191	£1,587	£-1,396

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuation of statutory development management service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to meet statutory development management requirements and targets.</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Continues to support sustainable development in line with the District Plan.	Continued support for economic growth.	Continues to engage with residents and communities in an open and transparent way.	Operational improvements to enhance the digital capacity of the service.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
--------------------

## 1 PL102 Planning Policy Service

### Description of Service:

The Planning Policy team are responsible for preparing and monitoring the District Plan which guides development and sets out the spatial strategy for East Herts. It is fundamental to the development management process in order to deliver sustainable development.

The team supports the implementation of policy through the production of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), updates to evidence, liaison with the Development Management team, and through advice to applicants and other interested parties. The service holds a substantial evidence base used to support both policy formulation and its implementation.

Support is also provided for neighbourhood planning across the district.

The Local Development Scheme sets out the project plan for preparing new planning policy documents, including production of SPDs and a timeline for reviewing the District Plan.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Planning Policy expenditure currently includes:

- MHCLG grant money for Neighbourhood Plan activity. Four Neighbourhood Plan examinations are being funded this year.
- The Council's contribution towards SASIG (Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group). This is an annual subscription which has already been paid for 2020/2021.
- LDF Upkeep and Consultancy money for District Plan review work, including updating the Council's evidence base. It is a statutory requirement to ensure that plans are kept up-to-date, to ensure that they remain effective

No transformation/efficiency proposals are proposed for 2020/2021 as the budgets are already committed.

The Council's subscription to SASIG could be reviewed in 2021/2022. The current budget is £1,860.

The Planning White Paper suggests that there could potentially be cost savings relating to plan making in the future but it is currently too early to say when these savings could be realised. This will need to be reviewed as reforms to the planning system come forward in more detail and take effect.

Planning Policy income currently includes:

- £40,000 Neighbourhood Plan Grant from MHCLG

LPAs can now claim £20,000 from when they issue a decision statement detailing their intention to send the plan to referendum (as set out under Regulation 18 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) rather than when a referendum date



has been set. Given that four plans are being examined this year, it is anticipated that an additional £40,000 of grant money could be claimed in 2020/2021.

**What do the public say?:**

Preparation of the District plan includes full public consultation at key stages.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	40	0	0	0
Capital				

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
141	40,000	141

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	-

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Income supporting each neighbourhood plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Continued support for sustainable development.	Continued support for economic growth	Facilitates community involvement in the plan making process	

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Under regulation 10A of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) local planning authorities must review local plans, and Statements of

Community Involvement at least once every 5 years from their adoption date to ensure that policies remain relevant and effectively address the needs of the local community.

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Economic Growth
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Jan Goodeve
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Sara Saunders

# 1 Planning Service Hertfordshire Building Control

## Description of Service:

PBC6 PL103 Building Control

Hertfordshire Building Control is now the building control authority for Hertfordshire. It is a not for profit organisation, with all the profit returned to local authorities in Hertfordshire.

It fulfils the statutory building control service for East Herts and other authorities in Hertfordshire.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Part of the premise of signing up to the Hertfordshire Building Control was to reduce the Council's overall costs of running a statutory building control service and overtime break even and return any profit to the Council's signed up.

The anticipated cost of delivery the building control service for East Herts in 2020 – 2021 is approximately, £44,300 as outlined in the table below:

Fixed Fees		Variable Fees			Total Fees
LA1 Fees	HBC Fees	non Dangerous Structure Investigations est 20/21	Disabled Fees forecast for 20/21	Audit Fees	Forecast for 20/21
£11,296	£24,000	£4,200	£4,767	£1,750	£44,263

The current budget for 2020/2021 is £22,440 and needs to be revised to reflect current costs at around £45k per year.

In 2019/2020 the authorities received a lump sum of £21,000 as a result of Dacorum joining HBC.

## What do the public say?:

**VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)**

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	0	0	0	0
Capital				

**CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£45		£45

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No.
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuation of the statutory building control service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to meet local authority building control requirements.</li> </ul>

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Limited impact	Limited impact	Limited impact	Limited impact

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

# 1 Planning Historic Buildings Grants and Heritage at Risk Grants

Corporate Priority:	Enabling Communities
Portfolio Holder:	Jan Goodeve
LT Lead:	Sara Saunders

## Description of Service:

Capital code ZC065 X400 C00060

Section 57 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 allows councils to make grants available for the repair and maintenance of listed buildings or other buildings of interest (Locally Listed or buildings in conservation areas).

The Council currently has two heritage grants schemes.

1. **Historic Buildings Grants** - the Council may offer grants towards traditional repairs or for works that reinstate lost features on historic buildings.
2. **Heritage at Risk Grants** - these grants are for buildings or structures on the local Heritage at Risk Register to help repair or restore them so that they can come off the register.

The purpose of the two schemes is to encourage owners to keep their historic buildings in a suitable state of repair and attractive appearance. The Historic Buildings Grant scheme allows the Council to guide the specification of works, monitor and, where necessary, intervene to ensure that any works to a listed building are carried out to an appropriate standard. The Heritage at Risk Grant seeks to save buildings or structures on the Heritage at Risk Register from total loss.

Three grants have so far been awarded in 2020/21.

The Council currently employs a consultant to manage the grant applications.

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The proposal is to reduce the capital available under the grant schemes in 2021/2022, with complete cessation of both schemes in 2022/23.

The current budget for 2020/21 is £20,000 for both grant schemes. £9,560 has already been committed, with a number of other applications already granted in 2019/20 and 2020/21 and not yet claimed. No savings are therefore proposed for the current year.

## What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

These schemes are well-received by the community. However, they are a function which is carried out at the Council's discretion and other funding streams are available which achieve similar objectives, e.g. the National Lottery Heritage Fund distributes National Lottery grants which fund projects that sustain and transform the UK's heritage. Historic England also offer

various grant schemes, including repair grants towards the repair and conservation of listed buildings.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue				
Capital		10	20	20

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
0	0	0

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No.
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	-

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential saving for the Council</li> <li>Other grants available (e.g. National Lottery Heritage Fund; Historic England grant schemes)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced ability to perform a pro-active role in the management of the Listed and historic buildings in the district</li> <li>Potential increased requirement to enforce against and rectify harm after it is committed</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Limited impact	Possible impact on listed buildings that are also businesses	The grant schemes encourage owners to keep their historic buildings in a suitable state of repair and attractive appearance. However, other grants potentially available which could achieve the same objectives.	Limited impact

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is no requirement on the Council to make grants available for the repair and maintenance of listed buildings or other buildings of interest (Locally Listed or buildings in conservation areas).

# 1 Revenues & Benefits shared service RB 001

Corporate Priority: Enabling communities

Portfolio Holder: Geoff Williamson

LT Lead: Su Tarran

## Description of Service:

The Revenues & Benefit shared service, cover a range of functions including the administration and collection of Council Tax and Business rates, and the administration and award of Housing benefit, and Council Tax support.

Cost of staff are recharged between partners based on a number of factors but are ????

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Most of the following proposals will require redundancies, and one is achieved through retirement of the post holder in October 2020.

**1. Overpayment Officer: - will require a redundancy.** 1FTE scale 5 c£36,000 (EHC = 32%)  
Reduce team by 1FTE post. **EHC saving = £11,520**

Level of debt raised has been reducing as less Housing Benefit claims are received. The team have made significant improvement in processes and performance since being fully staffed, so this reduction will have a detrimental impact on performance.

Current debt level £4.4m (EHC £1.6m. SBC 2.8m)

Estimate new debt to be raised this year to be approximately £1.6m (£750k EHC, £850k SBC)

**2. Admin support post – control team - will require a redundancy.** 1FTE scale 3 c£29,000  
**EHC 49% saving £14,210**

This is a single post within the control team and supports fraud referrals to SAFS and any other clerical duties in the team.

These tasks would need to be absorbed by the Control officers in the team.

**3. Customer Support officer -- will require a redundancy.** 1FTE scale 5 c£36,000, 52%  
**saving to EHC = £19,k**

There are currently two supervisor 'officer roles' in the team, which supported working over two sites and dealing with front line enquiries. The customer support team deal with everything from direct debit recalls, customer enquiries, scanning and overflow work from the Council Tax or Benefits services. Increased remote working and the movement of face to face contact to customer services could enable a reduction in this role.

**4. Outside officers – 0.66 FTE scale 5 c£21,000 63% saving to EHC = £13,230**

The team monitors and carryout inspections of properties in the partnership area. This ensures that the taxbase is accurate and reliefs and exemptions are awarded on the correct circumstances. They also carry out specific requests from the Council Tax and Business rates team to investigate circumstances relating to occupation of premises etc.

One officer has given notice to retire in October 2020, and the work areas will be redistributed to enable this post to be deleted.



**5. Reduction in training budget £2000 EHC = £1000. EHC = £1000**

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The main Council Tax, Business rates and Benefits services have a high profile but customers are less aware of the roles within the teams.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£11	£59	£59	£59
Capital				

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£3,556,990	£1,873,360	£1,683,630

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Reduced salary costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slower recovery of income for the Council,</li> <li>other admin duties taking longer or not achieved</li> <li>reduction in taxbase intelligence or accuracy</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Less costs to the Council	Less costs to the Council	May impact on performance supporting customers most in need	Will need to drive more business to digital options to facilitate lost staff resources

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Redundancy costs

**1 Revenues & Benefits shared service  
RB 002**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Enabling communities</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Geoff Williamson</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Su Tarran</b>

**Description of Service:**

These are the retained costs & incomes which are not part of the Revenues & Benefit shared service

These include direct grant from Government and recovery costs (legal).

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

1. Reduction in salary budget :  
Only 'retained costs' salary post is in the technical team – providing system support for Planning and Housing on Uniform Idox

Budget is currently £106k, but only £37k needed for post – **saving £68k**

2. Reduction in RB002/3740 Court and Legal Costs – **Saving £15k**  
Reduction in cost for each summons issued charged by courts.

**What do the public say?:**  
Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Low public awareness.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED) £000</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue	£83k	£83k	£83k	£83k
Capital				

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£158,160	£544,000	(£385,840)

<b>EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

--	--

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Reduced salary costs Reduced Court and legal budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> <li>• None</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Less cost to the Council	Less cost to the Council	Less Council Tax burden	No impact

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
None

**SF001 Strategic Finance**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	CLr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

**Description of Service:**

Provision of core financial services to the council, include budget preparation and monitoring and preparing the annual accounts. The costs of the shared services for internal audit and anti-fraud are also charged here.

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

The Finance function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months. He will also seek to maximise efficiencies from the new ledger system functionality.

The council is on a path of reducing the number of days purchased from the Shared Internal Audit Service (SIAS) and this could be continued. The cost of 320 days from SIAS in 2020/21 is £106,920. It is proposed to reduce this to 300 in 2021/22 and this should achieve a saving of approximately £6,000.

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

SIAS performs well and this is reflected in positive user surveys. The recommendations and reports provided are of a good standard. The public would not be aware of the work of SIAS.

The Audit & Governance Committee have expressed a view that the number of audit days should not go below 300.

**VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)**

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£6,000	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

**CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£851,170	£0	£851,170

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	No
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs reduction will not impact on direct service provision</li> <li>300 days is adequate to provide a sufficient and reliable internal audit service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased risk of a lack of internal control, or a failure in internal control, being identified and rectified</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
No impact	Spending can be re-prioritised	No impact	Where service design changes internal audit should be used to advise on any changes in controls.

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The S151 Officer has to ensure that there is an adequate system of internal audit. This could be called into question if the number of days was to reduce significantly below 300.

## SF002 Corporate Risk & Insurance

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	CLlr George Cutting Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Provision of insurance cover to the council, including procurement and liaison with brokers and insurers. Also, provision of advice on risk management and maintenance of the corporate risk register.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Finance function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months. The insurance cover will be subject to a procurement exercise this financial year.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Not popular with the public as main contact with the public is repudiating claims against the council. However, this is from a relatively small number of residents.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£68,540	£0	£68,540

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
• N/A	• N/A

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The officers have to reply to claims within set timescales to meet legal and contractual requirements.

## SF003 Procurement

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Provision of advice on procurement and maintenance of the procurement system and records.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

A procurement officer post was created with the intention of having our own resource and ending the support from Stevenage. This did not go well and the individual who was recruited was unable to complete their probation satisfactorily. A saving of approximately £5,000 could be achieved by deleting the procurement officer post and continuing with the support from Stevenage.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Whilst the public enjoy the services that are procured, they are not aware of the procurement process.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£5,000	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£67,460	£0	£67,460

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A



--	--

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs reduction will not impact on direct service provision</li> <li>• Expert assistance remains readily available</li> <li>• Good example of partnership working</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of control as reliant on Stevenage</li> </ul>

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
No impact	Spending can be re-prioritised	No impact	No impact

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Procurement is a complex area and any shortcomings will expose the council to a risk of challenge. The council has several large procurement projects coming forward so it is important to have expert advice.

**SF004 Exchequer**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

**Description of Service:**

Ensuring that money entering and leaving the council is accounted for correctly.

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

The Finance function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months. He will also seek to maximise efficiencies from the new ledger system functionality.

**What do the public say?:**

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public would not be aware of the work of this service.

**VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)**

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

**CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)**

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£71,670	£0	£71,670

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
• N/A	• N/A

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

If the exchequer service was not functioning correctly the council would be likely to get into disputes with both debtors and suppliers.

## SF005 Central Budgets

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Central budgets for stationery, photocopying, books & publications and subscriptions etc.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Work has been done previously on reviewing and reducing publications and subscriptions. Some savings may be possible on stationery (£11,270) and photocopying (£18,820) if working from home continues. Should be possible to find combined savings across these central budgets of £5,000.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public would have little interest in these budgets.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£5	£5	£5	£5
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£157,080	£0	£157,080

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Costs reduction will not impact on direct service provision</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>N/A</li></ul>

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
No impact	Spending can be re-prioritised	No impact	No impact

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None.

## SF101 Other Expenses

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

This cost centre includes treasury management (£143,350), bank charges (£78,000) audit fees (£56,000) and the apprenticeship levy (£34,000). There are also amounts of £10,000 each for Chief Executive Initiatives and Leader Initiatives.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The larger items are all provided on a contract basis and will be examined as part of the procurement review. There is scope to reduce banking and merchant acquiring charges through a rationalisation of the number of bank accounts and retendering the contracts.

It is worth noting that the external auditors have put in a claim for a much higher audit fee, this is common across local authorities and will be determined by PSAA in due course.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public would not be aware of these budgets.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£348,250	£304,000	£44,250

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed?	No
-----------------------------	----

(If yes, date to be added)	
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs reduction will not impact on direct service provision</li> <li>• Good example of leadership and setting the right tone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
No impact	Spending can be re-prioritised	No impact	No impact

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None.

## SP001 Property & Asset Management

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Provision of property and asset management services for council owned buildings, including preparing and monitoring maintenance plans and liaison with tenants.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Property function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

Tenants have been grateful for the individual approach taken to re-negotiating payment terms and leases in response to the pandemic. This has also helped the council's position in arranging vacant possession of Charringtons to enable the Old River Lane development.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£462,820	£1,600	£461,220

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A



--	--

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The service should still be able to meet all health &amp; safety requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
No impact	Spending can be re-prioritised	No impact	No impact

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

As stated above, all health & safety requirements could continue to be met. It is unlikely that there would be any significant delay in agreeing new or renewed leases.

## SP002 Facilities Management

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Provision of facilities management and post services for council buildings.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Property function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months. An early decision on the future of Charringtons and what, if any, presence is to be retained in Bishops Stortford is needed to assist the development of those proposals.

The staff numbers on the FM Helpdesk, the ending of the courier service and closing the post room will be pursued as a matter of priority.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

There has not been a significant adverse reaction to the council offices being closed to the public.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£33*	£33*	£33*
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

- Minimum savings target, but likely to be higher

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£187,210	£0	£187,210

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
--	----

<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A
--	-----

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Saving has limited impact on direct service provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members may wish to retain a presence in Bishops Stortford</li> </ul>

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Reduce carbon footprint	Spending can be re-prioritised	Will require residents to travel to Hertford if unable to resolve their query remotely.	Will encourage residents on the east of the district to use digital services

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------------

There is no legal requirement for the council to have an office in Bishops Stortford.

## SP003 Wallfields

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Budgets for Wallfields including non-domestic rates, utilities and maintenance and caretaking for both sites.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Property function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months.

The Citizens Advice Bureau is likely to close their office in the short term but this does provide additional space to move staff into and decommission the Charrington site.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

There has not been a significant adverse reaction to the council offices being closed to the public.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£488,320	£18,000	£470,320

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL**

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Saving has limited impact on direct service provision</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Members may wish to retain a presence in Bishops Stortford</li></ul>

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Reduce carbon footprint	Spending can be re-prioritised	Will require residents to travel to Hertford if unable to resolve their query remotely.	Will encourage residents on the east of the district to use digital services

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is no legal requirement for the council to have an office in Bishops Stortford.

## SP004 Charringtons

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Enter text here
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Bob Palmer

### Description of Service:

Budgets for Charringtons including non-domestic rates, utilities and maintenance.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Property function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months.

It should be noted that City Heart have requested vacant possession from the start of June 2021 of Charringtons and the saving arises from the transfer of the building.

The closure will influence the cost reductions at Wallfields.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

There has not been a significant adverse reaction from the public to Charringtons being closed. Having a presence in Bishops Stortford may prove to be more of an issue for Members than the public.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	-£100	-£133	-£133
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£132,790	£0	£132,790

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Saving has limited impact on direct service provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members may wish to retain a presence in Bishops Stortford</li> </ul>

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Reduce carbon footprint	Spending can be re-prioritised	Will require residents to travel to Hertford if unable to resolve their query remotely.	Will encourage residents on the east of the district to use digital services

### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is no legal requirement for the council to have an office in Bishops Stortford.

## SP005 Buntingford

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Budgets for Buntingford Depot including rent £210,000 and non-domestic rates £117,760.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The depot is leased and essential to the waste service so there is no opportunity for any significant saving although we will seek to identify alternative cheaper sites or to seek a lease payment reduction.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public generally value the waste service but would not have any knowledge of the services based at Buntingford.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£417,890	£228,700	£189,190

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A



--	--

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>N/A</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>N/A</li></ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
--------------------

N/A

## SP006 Rent & Misc

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Includes rent for commercial and non-operational buildings and associated costs.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Property function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months.

Most properties are on leases not close to renewal and increases are largely fixed until the rent review period.

Approximately 80% of the £1.4 million of rental income is derived from four properties, Jackson Square shopping centre, Tesco at Ware, Co-op in Hertford and Waitrose car park.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public would not be aware of which buildings the council owns.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£185,940	£1,395,100	-£1,209,160

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
--	----

What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	N/A
---	-----

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

## SP007 Street Lighting

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Steven Linnett

### Description of Service:

Cost of electricity and maintenance for street lighting in car parks and areas the council is responsible for.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Property function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public would be concerned by any reduction in street lighting.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£6,100	£0	£6,100

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

**KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL****POSITIVE**

- N/A

**NEGATIVE**

- N/A

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability

Economic Growth

Enabling Communities

Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

## SP008 Land Drainage

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Sustainability
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Clr Geoffrey Williamson
<b>LT Lead:</b>	Bob Palmer

### Description of Service:

Repairs and maintenance for water courses and culverts.

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

The Property function will be reviewed by the Head of Strategic Finance and Property within the next 6 months.

We will explore whether some of this work can be undertaken by community payback teams.

### What do the public say?:

Add in any relevant information about how the service performs or is received by the community.

The public would be concerned by any potential flooding from a reduction in these activities.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£58,380	£50	£58,330

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>N/A</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>N/A</li></ul>

CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
--------------------

N/A

# 1 Shared Design Service

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Geoff Williamson</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Helen Standen</b>

**Description of Service:** Shared design service

## Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

We have recently agreed to a shared design service with SBC which includes a charge of £39,800 which gives us access to 1.0 WTE of a graphic designer. We could stop buying into this service and retain a smaller budget with communications to manage production of content through external designers as and when needed as opposed to having a permanent resource available. We could retain £19k and make a saving of £20k.

Given the service is shared with SBC there will be some redundancy implications.

## What do the public say?:

No data from the public.

### VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£20	£20	£20
Capital	0	0	0	0

### CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£39	£0	£39

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No – any restructure would require an EQIA to be undertaken however
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Revenue savings More flexibility with commissioning design work	Potential loss of local experience and knowledge should we no longer have an in



	house resource
--	----------------

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Limited impact	Supports a local business	Limited impact	Digital print solution in place

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None

# 1 Shared Design Service

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Geoff Williamson</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Helen Standen</b>

**Description of Service:** Shared design service

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

We have recently agreed to a shared design service with SBC which includes a charge of £38,498 which gives us access to 1.0 WTE of a graphic designer. We could stop buying into this service and retain a smaller budget with communications to manage production of content through external designers as and when needed as opposed to having a permanent resource available. We could retain £18k and make a saving of £20k.

Given the service is shared with SBC there will be some redundancy implications.

**What do the public say?:**

No data from the public.

VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)				
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Revenue	£0	£20	£20	£20
Capital	0	0	0	0

CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)		
Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£38	£0	£38

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No – any restructure would require an EQIA to be undertaken however
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	N/A

KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Revenue savings More flexibility with commissioning design work	Potential loss of local experience and knowledge should we no longer have an in

	house resource
--	----------------

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Limited impact	Supports a local business	Limited impact	Digital print solution in place

<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
None

**1 Planning Service  
Large Printer**

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Jan Goodeve</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Sara Saunders</b>

**Description of Service:**

Large Format (A1 and A2) printer which is used for printing architect drawings.

**Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:**

Since moving to a paperless environment which now includes digital planning application files there has been little need for a large format printer and it is now surplus to requirements.

The current cost per year totals around £6,500 and includes:

£2335 Consumables

£1580 Service

£2530 Lease

The printer is six years old and the lease was renewed by IT last year for three years.

This would to be replaced with a large format scanner. However, one is still available and can be installed again.

**What do the public say?:**

N/A this is an internal service only.

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)</b>				
	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
Revenue		7	7	7
Capital				

<b>CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)</b>		
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	No
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less time spent printing and folding large plans.</li> <li>• Promoting digital working.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible claw back from the renewed 3 year lease that was signed in 2019.</li> </ul>

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b> (please colour code RAG)			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Reduced paper			Full digital working

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Termination of the lease early is being clarified with IT.