

# **APPENDIX B**

## **BUDGET 2022/23 SAVINGS PROPOSALS**

## Economic Development

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

**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
- 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	£0	£15 (BBfA, DIZ and VH)*	£15
Capital	0	0	0	0

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

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

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£38	£0	£38

**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	Potential loss of profile and reputation amongst other organisations who are members (especially with regards to LSCC and DIZ)  In the case of Visit Herts some businesses may feel we are not supporting the tourism sector.

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

<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

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None

## Resilience Partnership

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Enabling Communities</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Clr Peter Boylan</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Jonathan Geall</b>

### Description of Service:

Emergency planning-related contracts – Hertfordshire Resilience Partnership

### Description of Transformation/Efficiency Proposal:

Reduce the payment to the Hertfordshire Emergency Planning / Resilience Partnership from £26k per year to £16k to reflect the reduction in hours devoted by the Partnership to East Herts that has already been made. At the same time, incorporate any remaining functions into the work of existing East Herts officers.

### What do the public say?:

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue	£0	(£10)	(£10)	(£10)
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

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

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£26	£0	£26

#### 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>No significant reduction to public services as it believed duties can be absorbed into existing East Herts staff base</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased pressures on existing EHC officers</li> <li></li> </ul>

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability

Economic Growth

Enabling Communities

Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None

# Community Transport

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

**Description of Service:** Grant support to operators of community transport

## Description of savings proposal:

Public transport is a county function in a two tier area. In the past, East Herts Council created a budget to assist with the start-up of community transport schemes in the wake of a reduction in some timetabled bus services. A number of schemes, plus a community car scheme, are now established and it arguably time to withdraw council funding.

The proposal:

- During the 2021/22 budget-setting round members approved a staged reduction in resources for grants for operation of community transport from £84k in 2020/21 to £21k in 2023/24.
- This new proposal is to (a) remove £21k from the 2022/23 budget (leaving £21k) and (b) remove the remaining £21k in 2023/24.

Of note:

- Recipients of community transport subsidy have been told for a few years now that the council's funding will reduce with a view it being withdrawn as the schemes become established.
- Recipients of community transport subsidy are all towns/parish councils (apart from the community car club operated by CVS) and so there is an ability for the town/parish to meet any ongoing need for subsidy from precepts.
- From this year, the Lynx demand responsive transport is in operation in the north of the district, arguably reducing the need for community transport schemes.

**What do the public say?:** No consultation conducted

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue	£0	(£21)	(£21)	(£21)
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

## CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£63,000 in 2021/22	£0	£63,000 in 2021/22
£42,000 in 2022/23		£42,000 in 2022/23
£21,000 in 2023/24		£21,000 in 2023/24

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

<p><b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b></p>	<p>It is likely that those with protected characteristics are over-presented in the passengers of community transport. If current operators were unable to continue services without council subsidy, these residents would be disproportionately affected. There are, however, potential mitigations (Lynx demand responsive transport in the north of the district, greater support from parish councils, access to the council's community grants to aid the transition to no council subsidy)</p>
---	---

<p><b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b></p>	
<p><b>POSITIVE</b></p>	<p><b>NEGATIVE</b></p>
<p>1. Reduced revenue expenditure 2.</p>	<p>1. Possible reputational risk should someone wish to criticise the council for withdrawing its funding for community transport at a time of promoting greener travel</p>

<p><b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b></p>			
<p>Sustainability</p>	<p>Economic Growth</p>	<p>Enabling Communities</p>	<p>Digital by Design</p>
<p style="background-color: orange;"></p>	<p style="background-color: green;"></p>	<p style="background-color: orange;"></p>	<p style="background-color: green;"></p>

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

## B&B Charges

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

**Description of Service:** Provision of bed and breakfast accommodation as temporary accommodation for single people when the council's hostels are full

**Description of savings proposal:** Increase the charge from single people in bed and breakfast from £110.40 per week to £129.33 which represents the maximum that can be funded in full from housing benefit funds (from the government rather than East Herts). Based on an estimate of 408 total weeks a year for single people in B&B, this uplift equates to £7,723.44 **income** to the council from national housing benefit resources

**What do the public say?:** Views have not been sought on this

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue	£0	(£8)	(£8)	(£8)
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

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

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£128,520 – estimate B&B costs	£45,043 – hb coverage	£83,477

### 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 – the recipient of the accommodation will not see any impact. The proposal is a means of maximising income to offset the council's costs

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
1. Increased income	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.

### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS



## Grants

<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	<b>Engaging communities</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Cllr Jonathan Kaye</b>
<b>LT Lead:</b>	<b>Jonathan Geall</b>

**Description of Service:** Revenue grants to third sector / voluntary organisations to support the council's priorities

### Description of savings proposal:

From 2021/22, the funding for both the council's revenue and capital community grants comes from the council's revenue budget. Thus, the two pots can be considered as one with, for the first time, members being able to determine the split between revenue and capital grant expenditure.

#### Proposals:

- Reduction of 25% in 2022/23 in the combined revenue and capital grants budget, that is £31k.
- Reduction of a further 25% (£31k) in the combined revenue and capital grants budget in 2023/24 giving total saving of £62k (50% in total).
- From 2022/23, replace £8k of the council's revenue spend on the combined revenue and capital grants budget with monies accruing in the East Herts Lottery Community Chest Fund. Note: the Community Chest monies are currently held in a suspense account pending a decision on their use.
- In 2024/25, end the sports development budget of £10k with the transition to potential s106 funding/external funding from 2024/25 enabled by funding from HCC Healthy Hub monies in 2022/23 and 2023/24 thus giving a corresponding saving to the council's revenue budget in these two years.
- Reduction in the council's grants to Citizens Advice (from a total of £152,018 from base budget and homelessness grant in 2021/22) by £13k in 2022/23, then another £10k in 2023/24 (giving a total reduction of £23k) and then another £10k in 2024/25 (giving a total reduction of £33k).

#### To note:

- The current split of community grants is £45k revenue and £80k capital. It is proposed to reduce the combined pot over the coming two years to then be £63k from 2023/24 onwards. Members now have the freedom to vary the balance of expenditure between revenue and capital grants and so could choose to continue to prioritise the existing level of revenue grant spend while reducing the capital spend.
- Town and parish councils can apply for community grants, although applications and allocations are low (in 2020/21 three capital grants totalling £24k were made and so far in 2021/22 two capital grants totaling £4k and one revenue grant of £200 were made). It is proposed to remove town and parish councils' access to the council's grants pot as they have the ability to raise their precepts to fund expenditure and it could be considered that they are diverting monies from community, voluntary and third sector groups with less ability to raise their own resources.
- With regard to the Citizens Advice Service, officers are aware that a number of authorities are reducing their grant level; Broxbourne BC no longer provides any grant to the local Citizen's Advice Service.
- Until 2020/21, East Herts Citizens Advice used £16k of its funding to pay the council for office space. We understand that they no longer have any office base and so could, in theory, absorb a reduction in council funding from lower office overheads.
- The council does and will continue to provide ad hoc to Citizens Advice. Previously, the

council has funded them to advice with EU citizen settled status applications and Covid work.

- The council will continue to support Citizen Advice's bids for external funding and indeed council officers are facilitating a range of third sector organisations coming together to put a combined bid to national funding sources, notably, the Big Lotto Fund.

**What do the public say?:** No consultation conducted

<b>VALUE OF PROPOSAL(S) PER YEAR (ESTIMATED)</b>				
	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>	<b>2024/25</b>
Combined revenue and capital community grants	£0	£31k <i>Giving a revised combined grants budget of £94k</i>	£62k <i>Giving a revised combined grants budget of £63k</i>	£62k <i>Giving a revised combined grants budget of £63k</i>
Replacement of council funding for community grants with contribution from the East Herts Lottery Community Chest		£8k <i>No impact on £94k grants budget as this refers to how the grants pot is funded</i>	£8k <i>No impact on £63k grants budget as this refers to how the grants pot is funded</i>	£8k <i>No impact on £63k grants budget as this refers to how the grants pot is funded</i>
Sports development grant		£10k <i>No impact on £10k grants budget as it will be funded from HCC Healthy Hub monies in this year</i>	£10k <i>No impact on £10k grants budget as it will be funded from HCC Healthy Hub monies in this year</i>	£10k <i>HCC Healthy Hub support ends; option for continued funding from s106 and/or external sources</i>
Grant to East Herts Citizens Advice Service		£13k <i>Revised grant to Citizens Advice of £139k</i>	£23k <i>Revised grant to Citizens Advice of £129k</i>	£33k <i>Revised grant to Citizens Advice of £119k</i>
<b>Total revenue saving to the council</b>		<b>£62k</b>	<b>£103k</b>	<b>£113k</b>
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

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

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£287k	£19k – homelessness grant used to fund Citizens Advice	£268k

#### **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>	Given the council's grants policy, a number of recipients with protected characteristics are likely to be disproportionately impacted in an adverse way – notably older people, those with physical disabilities, those with learning difficulties. See discussion above regarding mitigation

<b>KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduced revenue expenditure</li> <li>2. Potential for staff time saving related to the processing of fewer grants</li> <li>3. Increased drive to self-sufficiency among community groups</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some people with protected characteristics likely to be negatively impacted by lower grant giving to groups offering services to them</li> <li>2. Reputational risk of reducing money for support groups at time of recovery from pandemic</li> <li>3.</li> </ol>

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

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

## Parking – RPZ Permits

Corporate Priority:

Portfolio Holder:

Cllr Graham McAndrew

LT Lead:

Jess Khanom-Metaman

### Description of Service:

Increase the price Resident Parking Zone (RPZ) permits to reflect full cost recovery in line with new fees and charges policy.

### Description of savings proposal:

This proposal seeks to uplift the charge to residents for RPZ permit to ensure full cost recovery to the Council is achieved in line with the pending fees and charges policy.

#### Resident Permit Parking Permit Charge Calculation 2020/21

15% of patrol time spent in RPZs	2020-21 contract costs		
FY 2020-21 contractor Costs ( <i>excludes P&amp;D and cashless parking target costs</i> )	£628,000.00		
15% of contractor total costs	£94,200.00		
Permits / Voucher procurement cost (hard copies)	£10,000.00		
Customer Service engagement 5% salary pro rata	£36,610.00		
Parking Service staff engagement (N/A)	£0.00		
Business Support engagement 70% salary pro rata	£66,008.18		
Signing & Lining annual budget RPZ	£8,000.00		
<b>Total Operating Costs</b>	<b>£214,818.18</b>		
<b>Income RPZ Related (Permit &amp; Voucher sales)</b>	<b>£105,431.50</b>		
<b>Net cost of service provision</b>	<b>£109,386.68</b>		
2020/21: Total number of Permits in use #	1275		
	£85.79	Net Cost Per Permit to break even	
<b>Current</b>			
# 1st permit	£41.00	1019	
# 2nd permit	£82.00	256	
<b>Proposal</b>			
# 1st permit (revised cost) maintaining current price differential	£72.00	1019	£73,368.00
# 2nd permit (revised cost) maintaining current price differential	£144.00	256	£36,864.00
			£110,232.00
			0

**What do the public say?:**

No consultation undertaken. Formal consultation is required via Traffic Regulation Order advertisement.

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue	£0	(£100)	(£105)	(£110)
Capital	£0	£0	0	

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

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Initial assessment carried out as part of wider proposals
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	Low impact

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

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
1. Full cost recovery – service not subsidized by Council	1. Perception the proposed charge is unfair

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Formal consultation is required to implement the change of substance in East Herts car parks via Traffic Regulation Order.

## Parking – Standard tariff 7 days

**Corporate Priority:**

**Portfolio Holder:**

**Cllr Graham McAndrew**

**LT Lead:**

**Jess Khanom-Metaman**

### Description of Service:

Introduce standard car park tariff charges on Sundays across Council managed car parks.

### Description of savings proposal:

As part of the 2020/21 savings proposals the Council agreed to introduce a flat rate £1 fee on Sundays which will go live in October 2022 to replace the current free Sunday parking. Given that a number of businesses are open on Sundays could be managed in the same way as the rest of the week. This proposal means customers will pay for parking on Sundays in line with the current Monday to Saturday charging structure.

The formula applied to produce the estimated financial returns: car park revenue divided by 6 (number of days currently charged) to produce a typical “daily” value and divided by one quarter on basis 25% of normal charges are achieved.

### What do the public say?:

No consultation undertaken as yet. Formal consultation is required via Traffic Regulation Order advertisement.

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue	£0	(£70)	(£126)	(£138)
Capital	£0	£0	£10	£2

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

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Initial assessment carried out as part of wider proposals
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	Impact low

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
-----------------	-----------------

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Equitable charging structure applied across the week. Consistent.</li> <li>2. Ensure practical use of the council's asset</li> <li>3. Introduce additional revenue stream</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Perception the proposed charge is unfair</li> <li>2. Some Members may not be supportive</li> <li>3. Negative sentiment: local residents, local businesses, media - due the long standing free / subsidized offer</li> </ol>
--	---

<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT</b>			
Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Car park charge may deter car use	Income generation		

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Formal consultation is required to implement the change of substance in East Herts car parks via Traffic Regulation Order.

## Parking – Annual price increase

Corporate Priority:

Portfolio Holder:

Cllr Graham McAndrew

LT Lead:

Jess Khanom-Metaman

### Description of Service:

Annual uplift in parking charges from April 2023

### Description of savings proposal:

This proposal seeks to uplift parking charges on an annual basis in line with CPI in September (6 months prior the charge being implemented) but no less than 2.5% per annum from April 2023. Based on a 2.5% increase it is anticipated that this will generate approximately £75,000 per annum (assuming parking behavior does not alter significantly).

It is important to note that the applicable percentage uplift will be applied where it is practical to do so on tariffs and rounded up or down to align to the nearest 10 pence.

### What do the public say?:

No consultation undertaken. Formal consultation is required via Traffic Regulation Order advertisement.

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue	£0	£0	(£75)	(£75)
Capital	£0	£0	0	£5

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

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	Initial assessment carried out as part of wider proposals
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	Impact low on protected characteristics

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
3. Annual uplift in income in line with a number	2. Perception the proposed charge is unfair



of other authorities	
----------------------	--

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Increase prices may deter driving			

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Formal consultation is required to implement the change of substance in East Herts car parks via Traffic Regulation Order.

## Playgrounds

**Corporate Priority:**

**Portfolio Holder:**

**Cllr Eric Buckmaster**

**LT Lead:**

**Jess Khanom-Metaman**

**Description of Service:** Parks & Open Spaces – Playground transfer to Town or Parish Councils

There are 63 play areas managed by EHC.

### Description of savings proposal:

The proposal seeks to permanently transfer 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 transfer

### What do the public say?:

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 generally already in the ownership of Parish Councils in East Herts.

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

As part of our public engagement exercise to inform the development of a new Parks & Open Spaces Strategy, 179 customers completed an online questionnaire. 43% of respondents listed “opportunities for play” as one of the three most important things that people believe a park should offer. To put this into context, the highest choice was “habitats for wildlife” at 61% then “places to walk” at 45%.

Of the 94 separate comments, eight felt there should be no commercialisation and of these, one reflected that such an approach could alarm residents that play areas might be closed.

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue		(£5)	(£10)	(£10)
Capital	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£103		

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Initial assessment carried out as part of wider proposals
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	Low impact

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

<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
4. Small budget saving 5. Offsets inspection pressure for client team monitoring .	1. Prevents closure and need to reduce facilities for young people potentially undermining the Council’s corporate objective; “Enabling our communities” to invest in our places, ensure all voices in the community are heard and support our vulnerable residents

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

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

Members should also note that as Town and Parish Council operate play areas then EHC provision represents “double taxation” and should be remedied by either transfer of the asset to Town and Parish Councils, ceasing this provision or levying a special expense for council tax purposes. Generally the special expense route will be more expensive for the local taxpayers than the town or parish council taking over the playgrounds. Further detailed advice to parish councils on double taxation is available by following this link: [NALC Guidance on double taxation](#)

## Paper Recycling Boxes:

Corporate Priority:

Portfolio Holder:

Cllr Graham McAndrew

LT Lead:

Jess Khanom-Metaman

### Description of Service:

Paper Recycling Boxes

### Description of savings proposal:

Removal of the 45L box option and lids for replacement containers. Standard 55L box offered for replacements.

Residents store 45L boxes inside recycling bin reducing recycling capacity of the bin.

45L boxes are broken and lost more frequently than 55L

45L boxes cost £3.14 more than the standard 55L box

55L boxes provide more recycling capacity

Availability of 45L boxes from manufacturers is increasing unreliable.

55L box is the standard box size in the majority of local authorities.

Lids can help reduce water content of paper – not all households use them.

Saving estimates are based on average purchase costs for 19/20, 20/21 and 21/22 YTD (4133 replacements). Further savings likely due to reduction in loss and breakages and consequently delivery costs.

In order to ensure there is service alignment within the shared service, work will need to be undertaken to achieve the same outcome for this proposal with North Herts where possible.

### What do the public say?:

Some residents prefer the smaller box, because it fits inside the recycling bin.

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

	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Revenue	(£14)	(£14)	(£14)	(£14)
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

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

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
47,000 (Actual expenditure 20/21 £110k)	0	47,000

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

An initial assessment has taken place as part of wider proposals

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

A full 55L box will be heavier than a full 45L box for elderly or disabled residents.

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

#### POSITIVE

6. Reduction in loss/breakages (therefore waste)
7. Reduction in purchase & delivery costs
8. Increased capacity for recycling

#### NEGATIVE

3. Collected paper could have a higher water content if boxes are stored outside
4. Larger boxes are heavier
- 5.

### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability

Economic Growth

Enabling Communities

Digital by Design

Reduction in waste and increase in recycling capacity

### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

None

## Charging for bin delivery

Corporate Priority:

Portfolio Holder: Cllr Graham McAndrew

LT Lead: Jess Khanom- Metaman

### Description of Service:

Charging for new bin delivery at new developments and for replacement wheeled bins.

(Please note we are charging for delivery and not the bin which remains the property of the council). Where a replacement bin is required due to the contractor having lost or damaged the bin, then delivery will be free.

### Description of savings proposal:

In 20/21 we replaced over 16,500 bins and boxes. The cost of replacing bins, boxes amounts to circa £200,000 across the services. This proposal is to charge for the delivery of replacement residual (black) bins only at a cost of £40 for a new 240L bin and £25 for a refurbished 240L residual (black) bin based on 40% of bins being refurbished and a 20% reduction in black bin replacement. Refurbished bins will be offered only when available. Other bins principally blue lidded recycling bins will also be refurbished but not charged to continue to encourage recycling participation.

### What do the public say?:

Chargeable services are not popular, however we currently receive requests for replacements when they are not warranted.

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

	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Revenue	(£20)	(£40)	(£40)	(£40)
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

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

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
170,000 (Expenditure in 20/21 was £197k)	0	170,000

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has an EQIA been completed? (If yes, date to be added)	Initial assessment as part of wider proposals
What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?	Impact low

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

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
9. Reduction in waste 10.Reduction in purchase & delivery costs 11.Income generation	6. Chargeable services unpopular 7. Online payment functionality would be required. 8. Longer call times at the Customer Service Centre

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Reduction in waste due to more repairs and less unnecessary replacement			Online payment systems need to be developed to facilitate contact handling.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

EPA 1990 S.46 allows local authorities to specify the receptacle for waste and make a charge.

## Public convenience and CTS

Corporate Priority:

Portfolio Holder: Cllr Graham McAndrew

LT Lead: Jess Khanom- Metaman

### Description of Service:

Transfer or closure of provision of public conveniences in Buntingford and cessation of the Community Toilet Scheme.

### Description of savings proposal:

The proposal is for the transfer or 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?:

It is unknown at this stage if the toilets are of value to the community.

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)

	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Revenue	(£40)	(£40)	(£40)	(£40)
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

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

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£40,000	0	£40,000



### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>Has an EQIA been completed?</b> (If yes, date to be added)	Initial assessment as part of wider proposals
<b>What are the key issues raised in the EQIA?</b>	The closure of Buntingford would likely impact on elderly, disabled or pregnant visitors to the town as the more likely primary users of the facilities.

### KEY ISSUES/ RISKS/ IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduction in revenue costs</li> <li>2. Reduced need for Capital costs associated with refurbishment</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduced availability of facilities for residents</li> </ol>

### CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
Facility is old in design with no consideration of sustainable design		The provision of toilets is seen as necessary by some users. However toilets are not provided in other towns.	

### 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.

# Internal Audit Days

Corporate Priority: All  
Portfolio Holder: Councillor Williamson  
LT Lead: Steven Linnett

## Description of Service:

Internal Audit Services provided by Hertfordshire Share Internal Audit Services (SIAS)

## Description of savings proposal:

To reduce the number of audit days purchased from SIAS whilst still ensuring appropriate assurance is received on the Council's services. External audit no longer rely on the work of Internal Audit to reach an opinion on the statement of accounts and given the number of outsourced services the section 151 officer feels it is appropriate to reduce the number of audit days to 250 which would provide coverage of all major systems and with the changeover of audit approach to assurance mapping, Members should not see any reduction in the coverage of internal audit work.

The savings proposal will need to be discussed at Audit & Governance Committee. The Committee previously felt that 300 days was the minimum Internal Audit work required but this was before the introduction of the Assurance Mapping approach to internal audit as recommended by the ICAEW and other professional bodies. For comparison Stevenage BC which has a Housing Revenue Account and in-house services for waste and recycling has a total of 315 audit days.

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

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue	£0	(£20)	(£20)	(£20)
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

## CURRENT REVENUE BUDGET (NET DIRECT SERVICE COSTS)

Expenditure:	Income:	Net Budget:
£103k		

## 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
12. Cost reduction will not impact on direct service provision 13. 14.	9. Increased risk of a lack of internal control, or a failure in internal control, being identified and rectified although assurance mapping approach will mean Members and management should be able to identify control gaps and rectify them far more easily than the traditional substantive testing approach.  10. 11.

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

Sustainability	Economic Growth	Enabling Communities	Digital by Design
	Savings can be used to fund revenue budget		

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Council is responsible for ensuring an adequate system of internal audit and the s.151 officer advises that an adequate system of internal audit can be delivered in 250 days, rather than the current 300, without affecting the adequacy of the system of internal audit.

## Gilston Planning Costs Pressure Reduction

Corporate Priority:

Portfolio Holder: Jan Goodeve

LT Lead: Sara Saunders

### Description of Service:

The Gilston Area is identified in the District Plan as providing 10,000 new homes to 2033 and beyond. It forms a significant part of the Council's development strategy for the district and will provide a large contribution to the Council's overall housing supply. It also forms part of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town which involves four new garden neighbourhoods in and around Harlow delivering 16,000 homes by 2033; Five local authority partners working together; a sustainable transport vision to achieve a 60% shift to sustainable modes of transport; and £172m of government support through the Housing Investment Grant (HIG) to help fund infrastructure and accelerate delivery. We are signed up, with partners, to deliver an ambitious programme of transformative development and healthy new places through the Garden Town Vision.

### Description of savings proposal:

The planning of the Gilston Area is at a critical stage with the outline applications and river crossing applications due to be determined over the coming months. Other related work streams including masterplanning are already underway and require significant input in order to shape the detailed proposals. At the same time, the governance of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town is being reviewed reflecting the shift in emphasis from the policy stage to the delivery stage.

Support for the planning of the Gilston area has been flagged an ongoing budget pressure. This includes an additional £247,000 to support the planning function for Gilston area. Having reviewing the planning support required this could be reduced by £40k bringing the planning costs down to £207,000.

### What do the public say?:

Planning is an open and transparent service which can attract a significant amount of public interest.

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

	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Revenue	£0	(£40)	(£40)	(£40)
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0

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

<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>Income:</b>	<b>Net Budget:</b>
£620		£620

**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**

<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>
15. Continued proactive and positive engagement in the planning of the Gilston Area.	12. Vision and ambitions for the Gilston area and the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town may not be realised.

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT**

<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Economic Growth</b>	<b>Enabling Communities</b>	<b>Digital by Design</b>
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.	Continues to support sustainable development in line with the District Plan.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**