Public Document Pack

Legal and Democratic Services

ENVIRONMENT AND SAFE COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE

Tuesday 29 January 2019 at 7.30 pm

Council Chamber - Epsom Town Hall

The members listed below are summoned to attend the Environment and Safe Communities Committee meeting, on the day and at the time and place stated, to consider the business set out in this agenda.

Councillor Peter O'Donovan (Chairman)
Councillor Tella Wormington (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Steve Bridger
Councillor Alex Coley
Councillor Lucie Dallen
Councillor Chris Frost
Councillor Rob Geleit
Councillor Jane Race
Councillor Mike Teasdale
Councillor Peter Webb

Yours sincerely

K. Beldon

Chief Executive

For further information, please contact Tim Richardson, tel: 01372 732122 or email: trichardson@epsom-ewell.gov.uk

AGENDA

1. QUESTION TIME

To take any questions from members of the Public.

Please note: Members of the Public are requested to inform the Democratic Services Officer before the meeting begins if they wish to ask a verbal question to the Committee

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare the existence and nature of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in respect of any item of business to be considered at the meeting.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 5 - 10)

The Committee is asked to confirm as a true record the Minutes of the meeting of the Environment and Safe Communities Committee held on 23 October 2018 and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

4. HALF HOUR FREE PARKING IN BOROUGH COUNCIL CAR PARKS (Pages 11 - 26)

This report seeks a decision from the Committee as to whether or not they wish to support a motion that the first half an hour of parking in all Epsom & Ewell Borough car parks should be free. This would come at a cost of up to £240,000 per annum at a time when income from the Council's car parks is already falling short of the original target set out in the Councils Medium Term Financial Strategy.

In considering the viability of this motion, the Committee would need to consider what service expenditure within this Committee's remit could be reduced to meet the above cost.

5. ASHLEY CENTRE CAR PARK SAFETY FENCING (Pages 27 - 30)

This report requests agreement of additional funding to complete the Ashley Centre Car Park safety fencing scheme.

6. GARDEN WASTE REVIEW OF OPTIONS (Pages 31 - 34)

This report provides a high-level review of the garden waste service and options for consideration going forward.

7. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2019/20 (Pages 35 - 52)

This report summarises the proposed 2019/20 capital programme for Environment & Safe Communities Committee. Approval is sought for the programme to be submitted to Council in February 2019.

8. FEES AND CHARGES 2019/20 (Pages 53 - 68)

This report recommends fees and charges for which this Committee is responsible, with the new charges being effective from 1 April 2019.

9. REVENUE BUDGET 2019/20 (Pages 69 - 76)

This report sets out estimates for income and expenditure on services in 2019/20.

10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC (Pages 77 - 78)

The Committee is asked to consider whether it wishes to pass a resolution to exclude the Press and Public from the meeting in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the business involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended) and that pursuant to paragraph 10 of Part 2 of the said Schedule 12A the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

11. TRADE WASTE REVIEW (Pages 79 - 86)

This report has not been published because the meeting is likely to be closed to the press and public in view of the nature of the business to be transacted/nature of the proceedings. The report deals with information relating to the financial or business affairs of the Council and the public interest in maintaining the exemption currently outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of the Meeting of the ENVIRONMENT AND SAFE COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE held on 23 October 2018

PRESENT -

Councillor Peter O'Donovan (Chairman); Councillor John Beckett (Vice-Chairman) (as nominated substitute for Councillor Councillor Tella Wormington); Councillors Steve Bridger, Alex Coley, Robert Foote (as nominated substitute for Councillor Lucie Dallen), Chris Frost, Rob Geleit, Jane Race, Mike Teasdale and Peter Webb

In Attendance:

Absent: Councillor Tella Wormington and Councillor Lucie Dallen

Officers present: Damian Roberts (Chief Operating Officer), Ian Dyer (Head of Operational Services), Ruth Ormella (Head of Planning) (Items 9 - 12 only), Joy Stevens (Head of Customer Services and Business Support) (Items 9 - 19 only), Daniel Atubo (Grounds Maintenance Supervisor) (Items 9 - 13 only), Richard Chevalier (Parking Manager) (Items 9 - 19 only), Sue Emmons (Senior Accountant), Jon Sharpe (Trade & Waste Services Manager) (Items 9 - 15 only) and Tim Richardson (Democratic Services Officer)

9 QUESTION TIME

No questions had been submitted or were asked by members of the public.

10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made by councillors regarding items on the agenda.

11 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Environment Committee held on 11 June 2018 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

12 BUILDING CONTROL FEES AND CHARGES

The Committee received a report summarising the Building Control chargeable account for the 2017/18 financial year and highlighting adjustments to the Building Control charges scheme.

Following consideration, the Committee:

(1) Agreed to receive and note the review of the Building Control chargeable account following the end of the 2017/2018 financial year as provided within the report.

(2) Noted the adjustment to the Building Control charges scheme as set out in Annex 2 and Annex 4 of the report, which commenced on 1 September 2018.

13 REVIEW OF BEDDING OPERATION

The Committee received a report proposing that the majority of the borough flower bedding contract be brought in-house from 1 January 2019. It was proposed that only hanging baskets and troughs would be tendered for contract.

The Committee was informed that bringing the planting and maintenance of the Council's flowerbeds in-house would enable the quality of the service to be maintained within its existing budget. An estimation from the existing contractor had indicated that a 26% increase in the cost of the service would be encountered if the existing contract were to be renewed.

The Committee considered the following matters:

a) **Volunteer groups.** The Committee was informed that the in-house service would complement, not replace voluntary groups who currently maintained a number of flower beds within the Borough.

b) **Maintenance of beds.** Officers informed the Committee that bringing the service in-house would enable a rolling programme of improvements to the flower beds to be put in place. This would include both replacing soil and repairing structural elements of the beds, and would be implemented on a rolling basis over several years.

Following consideration, the Committee:

(1) Agreed that the contract for the borough bedding scheme be brought back in-house to commence on 1 January 2019.

(2) Agreed that a procurement exercise be conducted for the borough hanging basket/troughs to commence on 1 January 2019.

14 SIMPLY WEEKLY RECYCLING SURVEY

The Committee received a report providing a summary of responses received to a residents' satisfaction survey for the Council's Simply Weekly Recycling service.

The following matters were considered:

a) **High satisfaction with service.** The Committee noted that the results of the survey had detailed that 90% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the Simply Weekly Recycling service.

b) **Residents' complaints.** Officers informed the Committee that complaints received regarding the service were taken on-board and responded to appropriately. Collection lorries were fitted with cameras, and footage from these was of assistance in resolving concerns raised by residents. The Committee was informed that the service had a 99.9% successful collection rate.

Following consideration, the Committee:

(1) Agreed that it had reviewed and commented on the survey's findings.

15 RECYCLING INCOMES

The Committee received a report summarising the market conditions currently negatively affecting the Council's recycling income.

The Committee was informed that China had banned the import of paper, card and plastics for recycling in late 2017 and early 2018 and that as a result an oversupply of such materials to the remaining markets had adversely affected the gate fee for their recycling and disposal. This had coincided with a reduction in the recycling credit payment made by Surrey County Council, and these two factors had led to a Quarter 1 full-year forecast overspend of c.£164,000.

Following consideration of the report, the Committee:

(1) Agreed to authorise officers to investigate options for mitigating the budgetary impact of negative market conditions.

16 CAR PARKING WORKING GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Committee received a report presenting the terms of reference for the car parking working group. It was noted that following a change in senior officer structure at the Council, the relevant Head of Service for parking would be added as a support officer to the working group.

Following consideration, the Committee:

(1) Approved the terms of reference agreed by the car parking working group outlined in section 3 of the report.

17 CAR PARK FEES AND CHARGES 2019/20

The Committee received a report seeking agreement for changes to car parking fees and charges during 2019/20, as discussed by the cross-party parking working group.

Following consideration, the Committee:

(1) Agreed the changes to business and residential permit fees as identified by the cross party Parking Working Group in Annex 1 to the report.

(2) Agreed that car park tariffs are not increased in 2019/20.

18 CAR PARKS AT ALEXANDRA AND GIBRALTAR RECREATION GROUND

The Committee received a report proposing that enforceable parking restrictions be introduced at Alexandra Recreation Ground and Gibraltar Recreation Ground car parks. Charges would not be introduced for use of the car parks, but a 4 hour maximum stay restriction would be enforced. This would prevent all-day use by commuters but still enable users of the recreation grounds to park there.

Following consideration, the Committee:

(1) Agreed to a proposal to add the car parks at Alexandra Recreation Ground and Gibraltar Recreation Ground to the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council (Off Street Parking Places) Order June 2018;

(2) Agreed to introduce a 4 hour maximum stay restriction, no return within 1 hour, between the hours of 8:00am – 6:00pm Monday to Friday.

(3) Authorised the Chief Legal Officer to publish such notice(s) and/or make such order as is considered necessary to give effect to the recommendations;

(4) Agreed that any objections or representations received following consultation are brought back to a future Environment and Safe Communities Committee.

(5) Agreed to Epsom & Ewell Borough Council officers enforcing parking restrictions within these car parks as per the Off Street Parking Places Order.

19 ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

The Committee received a report presenting a summary of current on street parking enforcement arrangements and seeking authority to sign a memorandum of understanding in relation to on street parking. The Memorandum of Understanding would be between Reigate & Banstead Borough, Epsom and Ewell Borough, Mole Valley District, Tandridge District and Surrey County Councils. The Committee was informed that a revised draft Memorandum of Understanding had been received by the Council, and was being considered by its Legal Officers.

Following consideration, the Committee:

(1) Authorised the Chief Operating Officer in consultation with the Chairman of the Environment & Safe Communities Committee to progress discussions and negotiations on the Draft Memorandum of Understanding between the boroughs and districts and Surrey County Council;

(2) Authorised the Chief Operating Officer to make any necessary textual and other amendments following consultation with the Chairman of the Environment & Safe Communities Committee and to sign the Memorandum of Understanding attached at Annex 1.

20 BUDGET TARGETS 2019/20

The Committee received a report informing it of the Council's revenue budget targets. The report also sought support for changes to services and guidance on the preparation of the Committee's service estimates for 2019/20.

Following consideration, the Committee:

(1) Noted the implications of the budget targets presented to the Strategy & Resources Committee.

(2) Noted the operational savings and efficiencies identified in section 3.3 of the report and agreed that these be included within the budget presented to this Committee in January 2019.

(3) Considered how additional savings could be generated to address the Council wide funding gap of £113,000 in 2019/20. No additional savings above those included within the report were identified.

The meeting began at 7.30 pm and ended at 8.16 pm

COUNCILLOR PETER O'DONOVAN (CHAIRMAN)

This page is intentionally left blank

HALF HOUR FREE PARKING IN BOROUGH COUNCIL CAR PARKS

Head of Service/Contact:	Ian Dyer, Head of Operational Services
Urgent Decision?(yes/no)	No
If yes, reason urgent decision required:	N/A
Annexes/Appendices (attached):	**Annex 1** - Equality Impact Assessment
Other available papers (not attached):	

Report summary

This report seeks a decision from the Committee as to whether or not it wishes to support a motion that the first half an hour of parking in all Epsom & Ewell Borough car parks should be free. This would come at a cost of up to £240,000 per annum at a time when income from the Council's car parks is already falling short of the original target set out in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.

In considering the viability of this motion, the Committee would need to consider what service expenditure within this Committee's remit could be reduced to meet the above cost.

Recommendation (s)

That the Committee decides to either:-

a) **Support the motion that the Council should agree that the first half an hour of parking in all Epsom & Ewell Borough car parks should be free.**

   Or

b) **Reject the motion that the Council should agree that the first half an hour of parking in all Epsom & Ewell Borough car parks should be free.**

1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy

1.1 In considering changes to parking fees and charges the Committee will need to consider and balance the effective management of parking spaces, the economic impact on the Borough and the potential loss of income to the Council and its services.

2 Background

2.1 At the Council meeting on 11 December 2018 a Motion was proposed recommending that "The Council should agree that the first half an hour of parking in all Epsom & Ewell Borough Car Parks should be free".

2.2 The Council referred the motion to the Environment and Safe Communities Committee for consideration.

2.3 In considering this motion and the potential impacts it has been assumed that the motion refers to half an hour of free parking being offered within the Council car parks with the car park user then leaving the car park within that half an hour. The alternative being that the first half an hour parking is free to all car park users regardless of their length of stay. This would be almost impossible to calculate with any accuracy but the financial impact would certainly be greater than those considered in this report. The costs to administer such a change would also be far greater.

2.4 Following the approval of the 2019/20 car park fees and charges by the Committee in October 2018 a shortfall of £104,000 has already been identified against the medium-term financial strategy target determined by the Strategy and Resources Committee.

2.5 In addition to the above the Council's car park income for 2018/19 is currently forecasted to fall short of its target by approximately £120,000.

2.6 If the motion was passed any such changes to the Off-Street Parking Places Traffic Order would be subject to a formal consultation with objections and representations to be brought back to a future meeting of the Environment and Safe Communities Committee.

3 Operational Considerations

3.1 There would be a number of operational challenges and risks associated with this motion being passed, as follows:

3.1.1 If all pay and display car park machines were configured to offer free tickets for half an hour then this could lead to an increase in costs due to large numbers of paper tickets being required, an increase in litter of tickets and an increase in officer time spent re-filling the pay machines.

3.1.2 Currently there are no measures in place that would prevent a car park user leaving a car park after half an hour and either re-parking or moving to another car park to gain a further 30 minutes of free parking. To introduce such measures in either the pay and display or barrier controlled car parks would increase costs.

3.1.3 It is not uncommon for a car park user in the barrier controlled car parks to query a tariff or ask for a reduction if they have stayed just over a time-band setting i.e. someone who has stayed for 1 hour and 5 minutes may request (often unsuccessfully) for the one hour tariff to be applied. If the motion was approved and a car park user stayed for just over the half an hour, the difference would not be between two tariffs but between paying a tariff and obtaining free parking. This could lead to an increase in requests such as these but also potentially to users not having the means to pay for their parking as they anticipated being within half an hour. The upshot is that there would be a risk of an increase in verbal abuse or threatening behaviour toward car park staff.

3.1.4 In the barrier controlled car parks a user may return to the pay station within half an hour and therefore be entitled to free parking, should the motion be approved. By the time they have driven to the exit they may have exceeded the half an hour and be required to pay a fee. This would then either require them to leave their vehicles to visit a pay station or manual intervention from a car park officer to allow them to leave.

3.1.5 In certain locations such as the rear Town Hall car park it was not previously uncommon to see a number of vehicles dropping passengers off to walk to locations such as the station. This has reduced since the introduction of the barrier controlled car park however free parking for half an hour would allow this practice to become common place once more. The impact of this could be that parking space for those who wish to pay to park becomes limited or an increase in cars stopping and starting outside of marked bays potentially putting more pedestrians and other car park users at risk.

3.1.6 In recent years approximately 66% of income generated by car parks has been reinvested into the car parks. Free parking for half an hour would result in at least the same wear and tear issues being caused but without the recompense of as much income to re-invest in the necessary repairs and maintenance. For example, a vehicle visiting a barrier controlled car park for less than half an hour still requires a chip coin to enter and leave the car park, the barriers to rise and close on entry and exit and could still bring in oil or water causing damage to the car park surfaces without making a payment. The loss of income due to offering free parking would also mean less money to reinvest in the car parks themselves and could therefore lead to safety risks or poor conditions for parking.

4 Financial and Manpower Implications

4.1 When considering the financial impact that could be caused by offering a free half hour in our car parks it is important to note the following:

4.1.1 In the Council's pay and display car parks in Depot Road, Upper High Street, West Hill and Atkins the minimum tariff is at least 1 hour so it is not possible to calculate the exact length of stay for those purchasing a ticket for the minimum fee.

4.1.2 Likewise it is not possible to determine the length of stay for a car park user purchasing a pay and display ticket for the evening in either Dorset House, Ewell High Street or Bourne Hall.

4.1.3 In the Council's barrier controlled car parks it is possible to calculate the number of visitors who currently remain for up to half an hour as the chip coin system allows for the time of entry, payment and exit to be tracked. However the Committee would also have to consider that a greater number may reduce the time they typically stay in the car park to take advantage of free parking.

4.2 In total the direct financial impact caused by loss of revenue from introducing a free half hour tariff in each of the Borough Council car parks is estimated at between £139,000 and £240,000 per year. This estimate is based on the car park usage figures for 2017/18, and considers purely those visitors who stayed in the car park for up to half an hour.

4.3 If users who currently stay for longer than 30 minutes cut short their stay in order to leave within half an hour, then the financial impact would be far more significant.

4.4 There would be a cost to re-programme all car park ticket machines as pay and display ticket machines would need to issue a free ticket for a stay of up to half an hour. The barrier control machines would need a grace time extension applied after entry to allow the free parking to occur. The cost of this is likely to be in the region of £6,000.

4.5 Appropriate signage and changes to tariff boards would need to be made. As these changes would affect all car parks the changes are likely to cost a minimum of £12,000.

4.6 There would be publicity costs to advertise such a proposal and to confirm whether the change was going ahead. This could cost in the region of £500.

4.7 The advertisement would prompt a consultation period which could incur further costs depending on the size of the response.

4.8 **Chief Finance Officer's comments:** The net income produced by the Council's car parks supports the provision of services across the Borough. Any reduction in this income will result in the need to identify an alternative funding source or find compensating savings from other services.

4.9 Based on visitor numbers who currently stay up to half an hour, the proposal is estimated to result in a reduction in income of between £139,000 - £240,000 per annum. However, if a significant number of visitors, who currently stay for longer than 30 minutes, were to cut short their stay in order to leave within half an hour, then the adverse financial impact would be even more significant.

5 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)

5.1 An equality impact assessment has been completed (see **Annex 1**) which highlights that blue badge holders and older or less able car park users could feel discriminated against as they are less likely to be able to visit their required destination and return within half an hour. (This does apply with any car park tariff structure but would be highlighted more so if a free period of parking was introduced. Currently Epsom & Ewell Borough Council offer an additional hour of free parking to blue badge holders subject to payment of the minimum tariff).

5.2 Off street parking is regulated by Orders made under Part IV of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. There is a statutory process to be followed if an order is to be made or amended.

5.3 In summary the process is as follows:

5.3.1 Prior to making an order there is a requirement to consult with certain organisations, to publish a notice of proposals in a local newspaper, and to display/deliver notices in places affected by the proposals.

5.3.2 If any objections are made to the proposals, the Council must consider these and may make modifications to the proposals. If the modifications are significant and may affect certain persons, they should be given further opportunity to make representations about the modifications.

5.3.3 The Council may then make the order.

5.4 The Council must then publish and where relevant give notice that it has made the order, setting out details such as a brief statement of the general nature of the order and description of the key provisions.

5.5 After this has all been done the order can come into effect.

5.6 Where an order makes provision as to the charges to be paid in connection with the use of an off-street parking place, and there is a proposal only to vary the charges to be paid, it is not necessary to make a full new order; a shorter process is available under section 35C of the 1984 Act.

5.7 A notice of variation of parking charges must be published in a local newspaper at least 21 days before the new charges are to come into force. Notice must also be displayed in the parking place. There is no provision for representations to be made or considered.

5.8 **Monitoring Officer's comments:** None for the purposes of this report.

6 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications

6.1 Income generated by the Borough Council car parks is used to fund other Council services. A reduction of income could impact these services, particularly if the required funds cannot be identified from elsewhere.

7 Partnerships

7.1 Any changes in the structure of car park charges should be informed by close engagement with partners to ensure a full understanding of potential impacts.

8 Risk Assessment

8.1 It is likely that passing this motion could have a heavy financial impact to the Borough Council's car parking income as well as an increase in costs in its implementation. The Committee has already recommended freezing the car park tariffs for 2019/20 which has caused a shortfall of £104,000 in the budget for next year.

8.2 The motion is likely to cause at least as much wear and tear to the Council's equipment and machinery without providing the financial means to make repairs.

8.3 There is the risk of an increase in dis-satisfied car park users who have stayed just over the half an hour time leading to potential conflict with those working in the car park.

8.4 There is a risk that half an hour of free parking may incentivise consumers to limit their visit to half an hour, thereby depriving shops of passing trade. This could affect the Epsom Town Centre retail offering, and consequently have a further negative impact on the Council's car park income.

8.5 A loss of income could result in a loss of other Council services or for funding to be required from elsewhere to support these. This could result in residents subsidising costs for non-residents to visit the town and park.

9 Conclusion and Recommendations

9.1 That the Committee considers the information provided within this report and decides whether or not to support the motion to offer half an hour free parking in Epsom & Ewell Borough Car Parks.

Ward(s) affected: (All Wards);

This page is intentionally left blank

Community Equality Impact Assessment Form

Community Equality Impact Assessments should be carried out whenever you plan, change or remove a service, policy or function. The process should be used as a health check – a way of consolidating knowledge you have on your service. Please refer to the Community Equality Impact Assessment Guidelines to help you complete this activity.

Name of service, policy, procedure, function or project to be assessed:	The proposed motion to offer free half an hour parking in all of the Borough Council's car parks.
Is this a new or existing function or policy?	This would be a new function.
Key purpose / objective of this service, policy, procedure, function or project to be assessed:	The proposed motion would reduce the cost of parking for some people who visit the borough
Lead Officer – inc. contact details	Richard Chevalier rchevalier@epsom-ewell.gov.uk
Directorate and Head of Service	Ian Dyer
Other stakeholders – list all involved	
Start date – The assessment should be started prior to policy / service development and early enough to influence the decision-making process	December 2018
End date – The assessment will need to inform decision making so the end date should take this into account	January 2019

Step 1: Identify why you are undertaking a Community Equality Impact Assessment

To consider the equality impact that the introduction of free parking for half an hour could have on car park users.

Step 2: Identify the proposed changes to your service

Describe the possible changes your proposal will have on your service. Also outline the possible affect(s) it may have on the **protected characteristics**. Following your initial assessment if it is absolutely obvious that your changes will not have any effect on any of the **protected characteristics**, no further analysis or action is necessary. In this event, you must clearly record how you came to this conclusion.

The motion could lead to a change in car park usage and in particular the behavioural patterns of car park users such as frequency of visits and duration of stay.

Step 3: Assessment of data and research

Identify what data and research is available to inform the impact of your proposals on service users and / or staff. Where there are data gaps you should include this as an action within your **Community Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan – Step 7.**

The financial impact can be assessed using the software programmes associated with the car park equipment.

Step 4: Consultation

Identify what relevant consultation could inform your Impact assessment. If you have recent relevant consultation data you could use this. If not, you will have to undertake new consultation, this should be included as an action within your **Community Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan – Step 7**. Make sure the extent of your consultation is in proportion to the proposed change that is being made. Have you consulted the Equalities Forum?

None at present although if the motion was passed then a formal consultation would be undertaken inviting representations from car park users or members of the public.

Step 5: Impact Assessment

Use the data, research and consultation results to consider the positive and negative impacts of the proposals in respect of the three aims;

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- Advance equality of opportunity; and
- Foster good relations

and the protected characteristics of the Equality Duty. Don't forget to consider staff as well as service users. Please use the template below.

Equality Strand	Positive It could benefit Yes / No	Negative Yes (High / Low) / No	No Impact (Yes / No)	Reason Describe the person you are assessing the impact on, including identifying: details of characteristic (if relevant) e.g. mobility problems / particular religion and why and how they might be negatively or positively affected. Identify risks if negative; identify benefits if positive
Age (e.g. older people, younger people and children)		Yes		An older or less able bodied person may struggle to complete their 'shopping' requirements within half an hour and would be subject to a fee whereas a 'younger' car park user may be able to dash in and out within the time.
Disability (long-term health impairment could include mental health problems, asthma, heart conditions, chronic fatigue etc.)		Yes		See above. The Borough Council currently provides one hour additional parking to blue badge holders subject to payment of the minimum fee. If this motion was passed there would be less differentiated benefit for disabled drivers compared with the general public and therefore, additional discount for Disabled drivers could also need to be considered.

Equality Strand	Positive It could benefit Yes / No	Negative Yes (High / Low) / No	No Impact (Yes / No)	Reason Describe the person you are assessing the impact on, including identifying: details of characteristic (if relevant) e.g. mobility problems / particular religion and why and how they might be negatively or positively affected. Identify risks if negative; identify benefits if positive
Gender (male, female)			No impact	The proposals would generally impact equally on both men and women. There may be a positive impact for those who have young children and drop them off and pick them up from some schools that are within walking distance of the Council's car parks. While the potential benefit from this can relate to both women and men equally, historically a higher proportion of women have undertaken this activity. However, there is currently no data available on this including what proportion this represents of all the men and women that use Council car parks.
Race (Minority ethnic communities e.g. colour, ethnic or national origin, nationality. This includes travellers and gypsies)			No impact	
Religion or belief (Believing faiths/religions e.g. Christians, Hindus, Muslims, people with no faith/religion)			No impact	
Sexual orientation (heterosexuals, lesbians, gay men and bisexual men or women)			No impact	
Gender re-assignment (people who intend, are in the process of or have undergone gender reassignment)			No impact	
Marriage and civil partnership – (only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination)			No impact	

Equality Strand	Positive It could benefit Yes / No	Negative Yes (High / Low) / No	No Impact (Yes / No)	Reason Describe the person you are assessing the impact on, including identifying: details of characteristic (if relevant) e.g. mobility problems / particular religion and why and how they might be negatively or positively affected. Identify risks if negative; identify benefits if positive
Pregnancy and maternity		Yes		Again it is possible that pregnant car park users or those with very young children may take longer to perform the tasks they have when visiting a car park and therefore they would be subject to a fee while others would not.
Non-statutory Group Consideration				
Other equality issues (please state)			No impact	
Socio-economically disadvantaged (e.g. factors such as family background, educational attainment, neighbourhood, employment status)			No impact	Lower charges generally have a disproportionate benefit for those on very low incomes. However, the significant cost related to car ownership means that the discount of the first half hour would have a negligible impact overall. Removing charges for the first half an hour, may encourage more “dash in an out” type of shopping behaviour for some abled bodied people, which may benefit some types of businesses (click and collect) and offer less economic benefit others such as a (department store or clothes outlet).

Step 6: Decision / Result

Following your analysis, you should make a decision as to whether or not your proposal will negatively or positively impact any protected characteristics. You should take into account all factors such as finance and legal in your decision. Include information about whether stakeholders agree with your findings and proposed response (action plan).

Should the motion be passed and a free half an hour parking be given to all car park users it is possible that the change could lead to a disproportionate negative impact on the basis of older age, disability and pregnancy/maternity as these car park users are less likely to be able to perform their required tasks within the free half an hour period of parking than other car park users.

Step 7: Community Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Once you have taken all factors into account, you need to create an Action Plan using the template below. These actions should be based on the information and analysis gathered during Steps 1 to 6. It should include any gaps in the data you have identified, and any steps you will be taking to address any negative impacts or remove barriers. You should also identify positive actions. The actions need to be built into your service planning framework. Actions / targets should be SMART, Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time framed.

Issues Identified	Actions Required	Progress Milestones	By When?	Responsible Officer(s)

Step 8: Sign off

	Name & Job Title	Signature **	Date
Lead Officer:	Richard Chevalier	R Chevalier	21/12/2018
Validated By: **(Head of Service)**	Ian Dyer	I Dyer	27/12/2018
Approved By: **(Equalities Lead)**			
Published on website by: **(Consultation & Communication team)**			

** Please type your name to allow forms to be sent electronically

Ashley Centre Car Park Safety Fencing

Head of Service/Contact:	Mark Shephard, Head of Property and Regeneration
Urgent Decision?(yes/no)	No
If yes, reason urgent decision required:	N/A
Annexes/Appendices (attached):	None
Other available papers (not attached):	Project Appraisal Form – Environment Committee Bid 4, Environment Committee, 30 January 2018

Report summary

This report requests agreement of additional funding to complete the Ashley Centre Car Park safety fencing scheme.

Recommendation (s)

That the Committee supports the budget increase of £23,000 to the Ashley Centre Car Park safety fencing scheme, subject to the agreement by Strategy and Resources committee to the funding from the capital receipts reserve.

1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy

1.1 The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) includes the following guideline relevant to investment in services:-

1.1.1 Prioritise capital investment to ensure retained property is fit for purpose.

2 Background

2.1 In September 2017 a capital bid was made to install security fencing on levels 4C and 5 of the Ashley centre car park. The purpose of this was t prevent anti-social behaviour, such as items being dropped from top floor of car park, and to deter potential attempts from those wishing to self-harm.

2.2 The proposal was split as follows:

Fencing	£97,240
Stairwell railings	£18,000
Stairwell windows	£18,000
Fire Protection doors	£20,000
Contingency	£11,760
Total	**£165,000**

2.3 The proposal and bid was agreed and funds were made available at the start of the financial year 2018/19. The works for the fencing and stairwell windows were tendered in July 2018 with return date of 17 August 2018. Out of five contractors invited only two returned with fixed price tenders, one of £168,502 and another of £153,495.

2.4 The project was highlighted as a most urgent priority due to the serious issues of suicides at the car park, the most recent incidents occurring on 24 September 2017 and 14 June 2018. This highlighted the urgency, with the Police and Ashley Centre shopping management calling for urgent action.

2.5 The initial works order was placed on 28 September 2018, but after investigations it was deemed that the floor surface of level 4D was not suitable to fix to, as this would damage the waterproofing between the floors and could cause leaks into the shops units below.

2.6 Additional structural investigations were carried out to ascertain a safe fixing mechanism to prevent wind from blowing the railings off the roof. This prevented orders being made for all materials in a single process, splitting the ordering into 2 phases. The two separate deliveries required two cranes to lift materials on to roof rather than one.

2.7 The project commenced on 19 November 2018 and is due for completion by 8 February 2019.

3 Proposals

3.1 The budget of £165,000 for the project has been exceeded due to the following issues:

3.2 Instructions to proceed most urgently - this required a quick turnaround of computer aided design drawings by a consultant which cost an additional £5,390.

3.3 To proceed quickly, an initial order for the first phase of fencing was made rather than waiting for structural investigations to be completed, saving 2 weeks in time. An additional crane hire was required at an unbudgeted cost of £3,451.

3.4 Fencing extra works – additional areas between the Playhouse and car park were agreed at a pre-start meeting. Issues had previously occurred with shopping trollies being thrown off the roof. This area was not proposed in original capital bid paperwork and cost £5,655.

3.5 Structural investigation as detailed in paragraph 2.6 cost £4,760.

3.6 Cost of lightening protection measures not initially included in bid - £4,869.

3.7 These unexpected extra costs total £24,125, and when offset by a small favourable variance, result in additional budget requirement of £23,000.

3.8 This project has been undertaken in consultation with the shopping centre who have agreed a contribution to the works.

4 Financial and Manpower Implications

4.1 It is proposed that the additional budget of £23,000 be met from the capital receipts reserve. A report to Strategy and Resources Committee on 31 January 2019 will seek approval to the use of capital receipts to fund the extra costs, subject to the support from this Environment and Safe Communities Committee.

4.2 The expected uncommitted balance of capital receipts at 31 March 2019, assuming the current capital programme is implemented, is £3.18 million.

4.3 The 2019/20 Capital Programme which will be submitted to Council in February 2019 for approval, requests a sum of capital receipts totalling £364,000, reducing the uncommitted capital receipts balance to £2.82 million.

4.4 Utilising £23,000 of capital receipts for the additional funding requirement of this project will further reduce that projected balance to £2.8 million. Under the Medium Term Financial Strategy, Council has agreed to maintain a minimum uncommitted balance of £1 million in the capital receipts reserve.

4.5 **Chief Finance Officer's comments:** All financial implications are included in the body of the report.

5 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)

5.1 None for the purposes of this report.

Monitoring Officer's comments: None for the purposes of this report.

6 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications

6.1 The works undertaken as a result of this project contribute to Community Safety as they help prevent anti-social behaviour, such as things being dropped from the top floor of car park, and deter potential attempts from those wishing to self-harm.

7 Partnerships

7.1 The undertaking of these works is being done following consultation with the Police and the Ashley Centre management team, taking into account the interests of both groups.

8 Risk Assessment

8.1 The only risks foreseen with this project are those health and safety issues related to the works not being undertaken. As all aspects of the project were investigated at commencement, there are no further anticipated risks and project is nearing completion

9 Conclusion and Recommendations

9.1 The additional budget sought for this scheme is partially due to the desire to expedite the delivery of works as a result of the serious incidents that have taken place at the car park. The other sums relate to unforeseen items that required resolution to allow the works to proceed. Given the health and safety nature of these works, the Environment and Safe Communities Committee is asked to support the proposal to increase the budget for the works to the Ashley Centre Car Park safety fencing, subject to the agreement of the Strategy and Resources Committee to release capital receipt funding to cover the additional items.

Ward(s) affected: Town Ward;

GARDEN WASTE REVIEW OF OPTIONS

Head of Service/Contact:	Ian Dyer, Head of Operational Services
Urgent Decision?(yes/no)	No
If yes, reason urgent decision required:	No
Annexes/Appendices (attached):	None
Other available papers (not attached):	None

Report summary

This report provides a high-level review of the garden waste service and options for consideration going forward.

Recommendation (s)

(1) That the Committee authorises officers to explore opportunities to improve the garden waste service as outlined in this report.

1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy

1.1 Garden waste recycling is a key part of the Council's overall recycling effort in support of its Corporate Plan objective to keeping our borough clean and green.

2 Background

2.1 Garden waste recycling was introduced in 2006. It grew rapidly in the early years before maturing and stabilising. Key statistics are

2.1.1 We now have around 11,700 subscribers.

2.1.2 When the service was young we measured its penetration into our total houses each month. But as the service has matured and stabilised we have only twice returned to this measure, in 2011 and 2014. On both occasions we found that our penetration into total houses (about a third of houses use the service) was the second highest in Surrey, behind Guildford Borough Council.

2.1.3 Since launch in 2006 we have collected some 44,600 tonnes of garden waste for recycling. Garden waste collected for recycling now accounts for 16% of our total collected household waste. Weather significantly affects the actual amount collected each year, but our subscription level is such that we have collected well over 4,000 tonnes in each of the last six years.

2.2 So the service is successful and we have made no significant changes to it since we introduced Direct Debit payments in 2013/14.

3 Proposals

3.1 Officers propose to consider various aspects of the service. Some other councils operate in different ways, and IT developments – notably plans for a new CRM system – may offer new opportunities.

3.2 Areas for particular consideration are:

3.2.1 **Subscription fee structures:** Epsom & Ewell's fees are around the Surrey average level. But some other councils charge in different ways, such as fees to buy bins (as opposed to the fee for the collection service itself); discounts for additional bins; renewals discounts, same price for Direct Debit as for other payment methods.

3.2.2 **Payment methods:** Some councils do not offer Direct Debit. Others offer Direct Debit <u>only</u>.

3.2.3 **Subscription management:** Some councils control subscriptions by providing 'licences' (rather like the old Road Fund Licence, with a different colour every year to check you've paid). Others use electronic systems to check if a subscription is current, or to instruct the collection of an unpaid bin.

3.2.4 **CRM management:** ITC officers are working closely with service officers to procure enhanced functionality in our new CRM system. We envision a system able to automatically check reports and requests against subscription records (e.g. missed bin reports/requests for new bins). Currently, this must be done manually. The new system will also aim to integrate currently-separate Direct Debit processes, and could help implement subscription management strategies such as in 3.2.3, above.

3.3 There may be advantages and disadvantages to the various approaches used across some other councils. We seek to understand opportunities for new ways of working in marketing, finance, technology and efficiency, which might be of benefit to the Council and garden waste subscribers.

3.4 In the meantime, in the spring officers will survey garden waste bins. Any residents who present bins without a current subscription will be invited to pay, or have the bin removed.

3.5 Consequently, officers propose to follow this high-level report with a more detailed summary of proposals in 2019 once research – including the tender process for the new CRM and the bin survey – has taken place.

4 Financial and Manpower Implications

4.1 Officers will undertake a cost/benefit analysis of any proposals that would involve financial commitment – such as the electronic control of bin collections or the provision of bin 'licences'.

4.2 Officers will seek opportunities through the new CRM to link collections, customer reports and subscriptions, and subscription data to more efficiently manage the service.

4.3 Notwithstanding that our service is already mature and successful, officers will consider new payment structures, or other activities, that may encourage more residents to use the service.

4.4 ***Chief Finance Officer's comments:*** measures taken to increase efficiency of the service and maximise subscription collection rates are welcomed to ensure that income generated by the service covers costs. Any budget required to fund new initiatives has yet to be identified, and finance staff will work with the service to analyse any proposals brought forward.

5 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)

5.1 None.

5.2 ***Monitoring Officer's comments:*** None for the purposes of this report

6 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications

6.1 As above, we may learn methods to encourage more recycling.

7 Partnerships

7.1 Officers will seek information from our fellow councils within the Surrey Waste Partnership.

8 Risk Assessment

8.1 The Council's garden waste service is mature, successful and well-liked by residents. This project is designed to understand opportunities for improvement where pertinent.

8.2 However, it should be noted that the government recently published its new waste strategy 'Our Waste, Our Resources: a Strategy for England'. The strategy states that government will "consult on the provision of free garden waste collections for households with gardens." When planning the garden waste service, the Council decided that a free service would be undesirable for a number of reasons, not least because those households that do not produce garden waste (e.g. that do not have gardens or that compost at home) would effectively subsidise those that do (there is, of course, no such thing as a free collection, which would have to be paid for within Council Tax). An enforced move to 'free' collections would have significant negative impacts to the Council and residents, and would render this project null and void. Officers will prepare a Council response to the public consultation when it is published in late January. 'Free' garden waste collections are unlikely to be welcomed by any Surrey Council.

9 Conclusion and Recommendations

9.1 That the Committee authorises officers to explore opportunities to improve the garden waste service as outlined in this report.

Ward(s) affected: (All Wards);

Capital Programme 2019/20

Head of Service/Contact:	Lee Duffy, Chief Finance Officer
Urgent Decision?(yes/no)	No
If yes, reason urgent decision required:	N/A
Annexes/Appendices (attached):	**Annex 1** – Proposed Capital Programme **Annex 2** – Capital Appraisal form for Bid 2 **Annex 3** – Capital Appraisal form for Bid 3
Other available papers (not attached):	Financial Policy Panel papers 4 December 2018

Report summary

This report summarises the proposed 2019/20 capital programme for Environment & Safe Communities Committee. Approval is sought for the programme to be submitted to Council in February 2019.

Recommendation (s)

That the Committee:

(1) Submits the Capital Programme for 2019/20 as identified in section 4 of this report to the Council for approval on 19 February 2019.

1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy

1.1 The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) includes the following guidelines relevant to investment in services:-

1.1.1 Prioritise capital investment to ensure retained property is fit for purpose.

1.1.2 Maximise the use of external funding opportunities to deliver improvements to the community infrastructure, including affordable housing.

1.1.3 Maintain a minimum uncommitted level of capital reserves of £1 million.

1.2 A baseline criteria for schemes is 'Investment required to meet Health and Safety or other new legislative requirements' as identified in the project appraisals.

2 Background

2.1 The Capital Strategy was last agreed by the Council on 20 February 2018 at which time the capital programme was approved for 2018/19. Schemes for 2019-2021 were provisional pending the annual budget review and an annual assessment of funds for capital investment.

2.2 The Strategy & Resources Committee provided the Capital Member Group (CMG) with a remit for the preparation of a capital programme for 2019/20. Under this remit, CMG assessed all capital bids and recommended a programme to the Financial Policy Panel ('the Panel') for approval on 4 December 2018.

2.3 The programme presented to the Panel assumed funding from capital receipts and government grants. The Panel were advised that the proposed level of investment of £2.4 million over three years 2019/20 to 2021/22, of which £464k was to be funded from capital receipts and revenue, would reduce the available capital receipts balance to £2.8 million at the end of this period. The agreed minimum threshold of capital receipts is £1 million.

2.4 The receipts forecast assumes a £100k revenue contribution to fund capital schemes in 2019/20. This contribution is subject to the budget being approved at Council in February 2019.

2.5 The Panel's guidance relevant to this policy committee's recommendations was as follows:-

2.5.1 Priority schemes identified by the Capital Member Group should be presented with project appraisals to the policy committees in January to establish whether there is support for the individual projects, with any projects not supported being removed from the draft programme.

2.5.2 Schemes identified in section 4 of this report totalling £118k, requiring funding from capital reserves, should be included in the capital programme, subject to support for the project appraisal by this Committee.

3 Proposals

3.1 The Committee is asked:-

3.1.1 To approve the proposed capital programme for 2019/20;

3.2 The timing of the programme should be based on the ability to deliver with a realistic number of projects in any one year.

3.3 If all schemes in the proposed corporate capital programme for 2019/20 were to progress, and given the use of £100k of revenue funds, this would reduce the capital reserves to £2.82 million at 31 March 2022. Where possible the Council will prioritise the use of other funding sources such as revenue, external grants, S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy to preserve the level of capital receipts.

4 Core Programme 2019/20 Funded from Capital Reserves

4.1 The Financial Policy Panel recommended that the following schemes should be considered by this Committee for inclusion in the capital programme in 2019/20, subject to the Committee approving the project appraisals.

4.2 The proposed core programme for 2019/20 funded from capital reserves consists of the following schemes:-

Capital Appraisal form reference	**Scheme**	**2019/20** ***£000s***
Environment & Safe Communities Bid 2	Upgrade of some parking pay & display machines	43
Environment & Safe Communities Bid 3	Hope Lodge Extension to Car Park	75
Total		**118**

5 Financial and Manpower Implications

5.1 The Committee will wish to ensure that the Council has the capacity to deliver the recommended schemes.

5.2 ***Chief Finance Officer's comments:*** All financial implications are included in the body of the report.

6 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)

6.1 ***Monitoring Officer's comments:*** none for the purposes of this report.

7 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications

7.1 None for the purposes of this report.

8 Partnerships

8.1 There are no schemes dependent upon partnership agreement or funding. Schemes may, subject to evaluation, involve partnership for procurement or service delivery.

9 Risk Assessment

9.1 The CMG have used the Capital Strategy to balance the need for prioritised investment against a reducing level of capital reserves.

9.2 To help manage risks to the General Fund revenue account business case investment has been prioritised where it demonstrates a payback within 5 years or 7 years for renewable energy projects.

9.3 Funding has been identified to enable the delivery of the capital programme for 2019/20 and officers believe that there should be sufficient capacity to deliver these projects.

10 Conclusion and Recommendations

10.1 A programme of £118k, excluding any carry forward provisions from 2018/19, is recommended for this Committee in 2019/20.

Ward(s) affected: (All Wards);

Environment & Safe Communities Committee Proposed Capital Programme 2019/20 - 2021/22

	Original Budget 2019/20 £'000	Proposed Budget 2020/21 £'000	Proposed Budget 2021/22 £'000	Total Provision 2019/20-2021/22 £'000
E&SC Bid 2: Upgrade of some parking pay & display machines	43	0	0	**43**
E&SC Bid 3: Hope Lodge Extension to Car Park	75	0	0	**75**
Total Environment and Safe Communities Committee	**118**	**0**	**0**	**118**

This page is intentionally left blank

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

COMMITTEE & BID NUMBER	Environment & Safe Communities Bid 2

PROJECT TITLE

Pay and Display Machines – Ewell and Town Hall

ACCOUNATBLE OFFICER

Officer responsible for project planning and delivery of the scheme. Accountable officers are also responsible for post project review.	Richard Chevalier

DETAILS OF PROJECT

Project scope, what is included/excluded in the scheme	The proposal is to replace six old and existing pay and display machines with new machines which will also offer the benefit of card and contactless payment options. The project will also include the introduction of security lighting adjacent to each pay machine to aid car park users in twilight hours.
Project outcomes and benefits	The existing pay machines are now approximately 12 years old and becoming increasingly unreliable. This has increased officer time in inspecting and repairing machines but has also leads to customer dissatisfaction if they are unable to purchase a ticket and then fear that they may receive a penalty charge notice. In Bourne Hall car park a pay machine was recently replaced following an act of vandalism and the increase in customer satisfaction has been noticed by the staff at the centre with the machine being more reliable and also not dependent on the car park user having the correct change as a card option is now provided. The six machines identified, the visitor numbers and the gross revenue generated by each in 2017/18 is listed below:

Location	Visitor Numbers	Revenue (net of VAT)
00003T - Town Hall (The Parade)	**10,462**	**£14,618**
00012E - Bourne Hall(OS Door)	**71,826**	**£48,131**
00015E - Dorset House(2nd Right)	**53,575**	**£39,336**
00016E - Dorset House(1st Right)	**32,451**	**£23,672**
00017E - High Street Ewell(1st Left)	**24,936**	**£16,036**
00018E - High Street Ewell (2nd Right)	**26,329**	**£17,596**
Total	**219,579**	**£159,392**

Visitor numbers to the machine in the Parade can also be expected to increase from late 2018 once the nearby Premier Inn is completed.

If Members did wish to reduce the bid by approximately £5k there is the option to introduce the card payment element on only one machine in each of the Ewell car parks with the other machine remaining available for coin payment only. However with an increasing number of payments now being made by card it will future proof the machines if they did all offer a card payment option whilst continuing to give the residents of Ewell the option to pay by cash if

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

	they so choose. One benefit added in Depot Road and Upper High Street last year when new pay stations were installed was security lighting behind each pay station. With the introduction of the evening charge in Ewell car parks in 2017 there is increased usage of the machines after dark and with this in mind the second part of this Capital project would see the same security lighting added in the Ewell car parks, adjacent to each of the six pay stations. As the lighting is on a motion sensor it would also enhance security measures within the car parks at night.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

		Cost of Project £	**Comments and detail where necessary. Provide appendices where relevant.** Examples of business cases spreadsheets can be found in the Finance Handbook
a	Estimated cost of purchase, works and/or equipment	£43k	£38,500 for six new pay and display machines which include payment by card feature. £4,500 for security lights to be installed (within the Ewell car parks including behind the existing machine in Bourne Hall).
b	Consultancy or other fees	0	
c	**Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)**	£43k	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0	
e	**Net Costs to Council (c-d)**	£43k	
f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)	0	
g	**Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Bid (e-f)**	**£43k**	
h	Annual Ongoing Revenue **Additional** Savings as a Direct Result of the Project	£4.8k	Saving on maintenance costs of machines during warranty period. Currently approximately £400 per machine per year.
i	Annual Ongoing Revenue **Additional** Costs as a Direct Result of the Project	£7.8k	Additional £50 per year per machine, after the warranty period, for card machine maintenance. The loss of overpayments estimated to be £4k per year. Card charges to payment service providers for card payments could potentially equate to £3.5k per year.

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

Year	2019/20 £	2020/21 £	2021/22 £
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	43k	0	0

REVENUE IMPACT

Can revenue implications be funded from the Committee Base Budget? – Please give details	A budget is granted each year for car park equipment and maintenance. The impact of card payments are being calculated by Finance for forthcoming budget reports.

CORPORATE PLAN 2016/20

Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key Priorities? If so, say which ones and evidence how. How does project fit within service objectives?	Managing Resources. Car parks are an important revenue stream for the Council.

TIMESCALES

What is the proposed timetable for completion of the project? Give estimated start and finish dates for each stage of the project. These dates will be used as milestones during quarterly budget monitoring to assess performance of project delivery.

		Target Start Date	Target Finish Date
1	Design & Planning	Q1 2019/20	Q1 2019/20
2	Further Approvals Needed	N/A	N/A
3	Tendering (if necessary)	Q1 2019/20	Q1 2019/20
4	Project start date	Q2 2019/20	
5	Project Finish Date		End of Q2 2019/20

BASELINE CRITERIA

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

All capital schemes are assessed against criteria set by the Capital Member Group annually. Bids should meet at least one of these criteria. State which capital criteria(s) for assessing bids are met and why. Leave blank any which are not met.

Spend to Save schemes should meet the following criteria;

- Payback of the amount capital invested within the project within 5 years (7 years for renewable energy projects).
- The return required on capital employed should be linked to the potential cost of borrowing (MRP) rather than potential loss of investment income.
- Risk of not achieving return on investment is low.
- Clear definition of financial cost/benefits of the scheme.

Members may consider schemes with longer paybacks on major spend to save projects going forward, especially those that incur borrowing.

Is there a guarantee of the scheme being fully externally funded and is it classed as a high priority? Please give details of funding streams, including any restrictions on the funding.	No
Is the Scheme a Spend to Save Project? Will investment improve service efficiency including cost savings or income generation? What is the payback in years?	No, although an increase in machine failure would impact Council revenue.
It is mandatory for the Council to provide the scheme? Is investment required to meet Health and Safety or other legislative requirements? If so, state which requirements.	No
Is this project the minimum scheme required to continue to deliver the services of the Council? - Is investment required for the business continuity of the Council? If so, say how.	Yes. Pay machines are reaching the end of their life cycle and faults will increase. Parts for repair are becoming harder and more expensive to resource. New pay machines are required to continue to deliver the necessary service for the Council.

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?	No

PRIORITISATION

State which **one** of the four prioritisation categories are met and why.

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

1	Investment essential to meet statutory obligation.	
2	Investment Important to achieve Key Priorities.	
3	Investment important to secure service continuity and improvement.	Pay machines are required to continue to deliver the necessary service for the Council and maintain revenue levels. The introduction of card payments will improve the parking options currently offered to car park users and ensure continuity of a main council income stream.
4	Investment will assist but is not required to meet one of the baseline criteria.	

RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHEME

1	Outline the risks of delivering this project to timetable and budget. (Please do not include risks to the service or asset if project is not approved.)	There is the possibility that on removal of the machines that issues are found with mains connections. There may be a small loss of income in the period when a machine is removed and the new one fitted. This is likely to only impact the front of the Town Hall machine which does not have an alternative pay machine within the car park.
2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	• The age of the current machines increases the likelihood of failure and also increases the time and cost to source parts for the existing machines. • Revenue for the council will be affected if machines are out of action • Civil Enforcement Officer's time will be taken up with attending faults which means they will not be out patrolling streets and car parks. • Reputation of the council may be affected if machines fail
4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of who with and when by.	No. Planning department have confirmed that permission would not need to be sought.

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

Ward(s) affected by the scheme	Ewell, Town

Accountable Officer Responsible for Delivery of the Scheme

Name and Signature …R. Chevalier…….……. Date …20.9.2018……

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

COMMITTEE & BID NUMBER	Environment & Safe Communities Bid 3

PROJECT TITLE

Hope Lodge Car Park expansion

ACCOUNATBLE OFFICER

Officer responsible for project planning and delivery of the scheme. Accountable officers are also responsible for post project review.	Richard Chevalier, Tony Foxwell

DETAILS OF PROJECT

Project scope, what is included/excluded in the scheme	The proposal is to construct 14 additional car parking spaces in Hope Lodge car park to cater for increased demand. The project will also increase the size of some existing bays. To achieve this, areas of existing shrubs and seedlings within the car park area would be removed. Additional security fencing around the perimeter would be installed to ensure vehicles were unable to leave over the grass area. Following a discussion with the Tree Officer it was felt appropriate that allowance for four new trees is included. The majority of car parking bays within the car park would be increased in size to 2600mm (in total of 74 or 82 bays – see attached plan). This is in line with other recent car park amendments in recognition that vehicles are getting larger and therefore encouraging people to park in Epsom rather than other towns.
Project outcomes and benefits	In the first 6 months of 2018 the car park has been running full for a 15 minute period on 326 different occasions, and on 77 different days. Likewise the nearby Town Hall car park has run full on 128 different days within this period. Some people will wait for a space to become available in the car park whereas others will leave reversing back onto Dullshot Green in order to so. The increase in spaces will provide greater resilience for Hope Lodge Car Park which often runs full for the middle part of each day. Additional spaces will see an increase in car park revenue. The larger spaces and greater availability may also attract more visitors to the car park. This project was proposed last year but put on hold to assess the impact of the introduction of card payment facilities in Depot Road car park. Despite these works visitor numbers to Hope Lodge have continued to increase. In 2017/18 the average net income per space within the car park was £2,545. It is not possible to monitor numbers of vehicles in the queue at all times, but if the same average revenue per space was generated on the 42% of days that the car park was full then this would lead to an increase in income by £15,143 per year. This is based on the fees and charges within the car park remaining the same. To look at it a different way if the current usage rates continued to the end of the year meaning the car park was full on 652 different 15 minute occasions, each of these occurrences would require £23 to be generated to achieve payback within 5 year. On current occupancy

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

	rates this would equate to 8 users based on average duration and equivalent tariffs. As an additional benefit the machinery used to remove the lines from Hope Lodge car park could also be used to permanently remove the erroneous lines in the Town Hall car park and its approach road on which previous temporary measures to remove them have faded.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

		Cost of Project £	**Comments and detail where necessary. Provide appendices where relevant.** Examples of business cases spreadsheets can be found in the Finance Handbook
a	Estimated cost of purchase, works and/or equipment	£74k	Removal of Markings £3k New lining £7k Civil Works £52k Removal of foliage £3k Fencing £2k Contingency £7k
b	Consultancy or other fees	£1k	Planning permission and replacement tree works.
c	**Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)**	£75k	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0	
e	**Net Costs to Council (c-d)**	£75k	
f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)	0	
g	**Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Bid (e-f)**	**£75k**	
h	Annual Ongoing Revenue **Additional** Savings as a Direct Result of the Project	£15k per year	Based on estimated usage at times when the car park is full
i	Annual Ongoing Revenue **Additional** Costs as a Direct Result of the Project	Minimal	Potential increase in card use meaning payments to Payment Service Providers will increase.

Year	**2019/20 £**	**2020/21 £**	**2021/22 £**
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	£75k	0	0

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

REVENUE IMPACT

Can revenue implications be funded from the Committee Base Budget? – Please give details	Yes

CORPORATE PLAN 2016/20

Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key Priorities? If so, say which ones and evidence how. How does project fit within service objectives?	Managing Resources. Car parks are an important revenue stream for the Council.

TIMESCALES

What is the proposed timetable for completion of the project? Give estimated start and finish dates for each stage of the project. These dates will be used as milestones during quarterly budget monitoring to assess performance of project delivery.

		Target Start Date	Target Finish Date
1	Design & Planning	Q1 2019-20	Q1 2019-20
2	Further Approvals Needed	Planning Committee Q1	
3	Tendering (if necessary)	June 2019	July 2019
4	Project start date	August 2019	
5	Project Finish Date		September 2019

BASELINE CRITERIA

All capital schemes are assessed against criteria set by the Capital Member Group annually. Bids should meet at least one of these criteria. State which capital criteria(s) for assessing bids are met and why. Leave blank any which are not met.

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

Spend to Save schemes should meet the following criteria;

- Payback of the amount capital invested within the project within 5 years (7 years for renewable energy projects).
- The return required on capital employed should be linked to the potential cost of borrowing (MRP) rather than potential loss of investment income.
- Risk of not achieving return on investment is low.
- Clear definition of financial cost/benefits of the scheme.

Members may consider schemes with longer paybacks on major spend to save projects going forward, especially those that incur borrowing.

Is there a guarantee of the scheme being fully externally funded and is it classed as a high priority? Please give details of funding streams, including any restrictions on the funding.	
Is the Scheme a Spend to Save Project? Will investment improve service efficiency including cost savings or income generation? What is the payback in years?	Yes. The anticipated payback is 5 years based on increased capacity and additional use at the times the car park is currently full.
It is mandatory for the Council to provide the scheme? Is investment required to meet Health and Safety or other legislative requirements? If so, state which requirements.	
Is this project the minimum scheme required to continue to deliver the services of the Council? - Is investment required for the business continuity of the Council? If so, say how.	

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?	No

PRIORITISATION

State which **one** of the four prioritisation categories are met and why.

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

1	Investment essential to meet statutory obligation.	
2	Investment Important to achieve Key Priorities.	
3	Investment important to secure service continuity and improvement.	The car park is increasingly popular at peak times so the expansion will allow additional car park users to park close to Epsom Town Centre. The wider bays will also improve the parking experience for car park users.
4	Investment will assist but is not required to meet one of the baseline criteria.	

RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHEME

1	Outline the risks of delivering this project to timetable and budget. (Please do not include risks to the service or asset if project is not approved.)	Works will have to be carried out around operational use whilst civil engineering is carried out. The car park will need to be closed for up to 3 days at a one-off cost of approximately £1.5k, whilst the existing lines are removed and new lines painted.
2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	The risk to resource is that Hope Lodge car park only has one pay machine. The increased usage will increase reliability on this one machine and could cause added dis-satisfaction if the machine is out of service. As per the current arrangement car park users can use the machines at Town Hall car park if this machine is out of service. (The ratio of bays to machines would still be inside the Ashley Centre equivalent).
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	The car park will most likely continue to run full on a regular basis meaning vehicles will have to wait to enter or reverse and go elsewhere ultimately leading to a loss of revenue and perhaps reputational damage.
4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of who with and when by.	Planning permission will be required and further consultation with the tree officer. During the times the car park is closed alternative solutions will need to be found for essential staff and for those residents allowed to park in Hope Lodge overnight (currently 14).

Ward(s) affected by the scheme	Town

Capital Programme Review 2019-20
Project Appraisal Form

Accountable Officer Responsible for Delivery of the Scheme

Name and Signature …R Chevalier…..…… Date …25.9.2018……

FEES AND CHARGES 2019/20

Head of Service/Contact:	Lee Duffy, Chief Finance Officer
Urgent Decision?(yes/no)	No
If yes, reason urgent decision required:	N/A
Annexes/Appendices (attached):	**Annex 1** - Committee Fees & Charges 2019/20 **Annex 2** - Car Park Fees & Charges agreed on 23 October 2018 **Annex 3** - Trade Refuse & Recycling Charges 2019/20 (exempt from publication)
Other available papers (not attached):	Estimates Report 2019/20 Budget Report 2019/20 Report and Minutes of Environment & Safe Communities Committee 23 October 2018 (Car Park Fees & Charges 2019/20)

Report summary

This report recommends fees and charges for which this Committee is responsible, with the new charges being effective from 1 April 2019.

Recommendation (s)

That subject to the approval of Council, the Committee:

(1) Agrees the fees and charges for 2019/20 as set out at Annex 1 and Annex 3;

(2) Notes the parking fees and charges agreed by this Committee on 23 October 2018 as set out in Annex 2.

1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy

1.1 As set out in the revenue estimates report on this agenda.

2 Background

2.1 The Council will meet to agree the budget, including estimates of income and expenditure, on 19 February 2019. To enable the budget to be finalised, the Policy Committees are being asked to recommend fees and charges covering the services for which they are responsible.

2.2 The fees and charges presented in this report are discretionary charges only. For discretionary charges there is scope to generate additional income, to reduce the subsidy of the service or to contribute to an improved budget position.

2.3 There are a number of charges that are set externally of which the Council has no control or power to alter. This restricts the Council's ability to raise additional income and therefore the fees and charges set by statute are not presented to this Committee for approval.

2.4 The budget guidelines agreed by Strategy and Resources included an overall increase in revenue from discretionary fees and charges of 3%. The guidelines also anticipate that additional income may be generated to contribute to the required savings target.

2.5 When preparing estimates, fees and charges have been reviewed by service managers and any negative impact on demand anticipated by increased charges has been considered.

2.6 Members should refer to the estimates report on this agenda for an overview of the Committee's budget position.

2.7 In January 2018 the Committee confirmed that the Chief Finance Officer should have delegated authority to vary fees and charges for items generating income under £1,000 per annum and be permitted to set charges for one off services or items not included in the fees and charges schedule under delegated authority.

3 Proposals

3.1 The proposed fees and charges for 2018/19 are set out at **Annex 1** to this report. The main variations in fees and charges for each service area outside the range of an increase between 3% to 5% are set out below:

3.1.1 Car Parks

A separate report was submitted to Environment Committee on 23 October 2018, seeking agreement for car park permit increases and a freeze of car park fees for 2019/20. The Committee agreed in principle the fees that were set out in the report. The car park fees and charges in this report remain unchanged, and **Annexe 2** details those charges which the Committee agreed to change in October 2018.

3.1.2 Refuse Collection

Garden Waste: Income from garden waste has historically derived from a combination of subscription payments and recycling credits paid by Surrey County Council (SCC), previously at £23.05 per tonne for 2017/18. SCC advised that from 2018/19 it will start to remove garden waste recycling credits over three years as a cost-saving measure. The proposed 2019/20 garden waste fees therefore reflect a 3% inflationary element plus the forecast effect of SCC's cost-saving action in 2019/20.

3.1.3 Development & Building Control

Pre-application and Planning Performance Agreements: these fees have been reviewed in light of the requirement to deliver a significant increase in the amount of housing units within the borough each year and also the increased capacity, stability and ability of the Planning Team to provide more time and a higher quality level of service and advice than previously. Fees were benchmarked against the 10 other Surrey Local Authorities and 6 London Boroughs.

Following the benchmarking, pre-application fees have been rationalised and one residential and one commercial band has been split in two, along with the removal of just a note and no meeting option for minor and major applications and the removal of meetings for householder and small retail applications. In addition, all fees have been increased to bring them more in line with the London Authorities on the borough's boundary and also to reflect the service level and officer time that EEBC can now provide.

Self-Build & Custom Housebuilding Register: the Self Build Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 requires that all Local Planning Authorities keep a register of individuals who are looking to acquire serviced plots of land within the authority's area for their own self-build. Epsom and Ewell has been running the register for nearly 3 years. Since the end of 2017 all Local Planning Authorities are required to also submit an annual return of the number of individuals or groups on their registers to MHCLG (Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government). Preparing this return has a resource implication that corresponds to the administrative work involved.

As a consequence many Local Planning authorities have introduced a charge to cover this resource cost and it is recommended that the Borough Council do likewise. Having examined fees charged by neighbouring authorities it is recommended that the fee to enter onto our register be set at £30.00 (per household) and a further £15.00 annual fee be charged to remain on the register. No income budget has been set as current numbers are not significant.

3.1.4 Licensing & Environmental Health

Licensing Fees have been reviewed with most being increased by 3 to 5%. It is proposed that there is no increase for private hire and Hackney Carriage licensing fees this year as the trade has been significantly impacted due to factors such as the Plan E Highways Improvement works. It is anticipated that the budget will be attained due to expected additional school run driver income, but increasing the fees again may well lose income/business.

Acupuncture, ear-piercing and electrolysis and tattooing licensing fees have increased in excess of 3-5% to more accurately reflect the cost of administration and inspection of the licensing regimes.

4 Financial and Manpower Implications

4.1 The impact of the proposed fees and charges for services in 2018/19 is set out below.

	Increase in Income Budget Target (3%) £'000	Total Increase or (Decrease) due to changes to Tariffs £'000	Variations resulting from changes to volumes	Variation between Target and total change £'000
Car Parks	115	8	0	(107)
Refuse Collection	34	59	97	122

Markets	3	3	0	0
Development & Building Control	11	15	16	20
Cemetery	14	7	7	0
Licensing & Environmental Health	6	6	0	0
Total	**183**	**98**	**120**	**35**

4.1 The charges proposed will generate an additional estimated income of £218k. This has been taken into account in the budget to be presented to the Council next month.

4.2 The change of charges and volumes have resulted in the Environment and Safe Committee being £35,000 favourable to the targeted budgeted income from fees and charges for 2019/20. This is mainly attributable to increased income budgets within Refuse Collection, the largest of which is for Trade Waste which is undergoing service transformation with the launch of Business Bins. Development Management is also contributing to the favourable variance with an increased budget for Planning Performance Agreements to be launched in the new year. These are partially offset by the adverse variance in car parks following the decision by the Committee in October 2018 to hold car park fees at 2018/19 rates for 2019/20.

4.3 The revised level of income has been included in the medium term financial strategy to help towards a balanced budget over its 4 years life. A detailed breakdown of the 2019/20 budget can be found in the budget report included on this agenda.

4.4 **Chief Finance Officer's comments:** all financial implications are included within this report.

5 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)

5.1 There are no specific issues arising from this report but the Council's resources will need to be applied to ensure that it fulfils its statutory obligations and delivers its policy on equalities.

5.2 ***Monitoring Officer's comments:*** as above

6 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications

6.1 None for the purposes of this report.

7 Partnerships

7.1 None for the purposes of this report.

8 Risk Assessment

8.1 Income from services remains at risk due to the state of the economy. Charges have been set taking into account market conditions.

8.2 The continued delivery of Council services is dependent upon income generation, creating a risk to service delivery if charges are not set at levels that make a significant contribution to the Council's finances.

9 Conclusion and Recommendations

9.1 This report proposes new fees and charges for services with effect from 1 April 2019.

9.2 The impact of changes in fees and charges has been estimated and incorporated in the Committee's budget estimates 2019/20. If lower charges are agreed the Committee will be required to identify cost savings to enable the Council to meet its overall budget target.

Ward(s) affected: (All Wards);

Service	Service Activity	Service Head	Description	Unit	2018/19	2019/20	% Change
					£	£	
Car Parking	Annual Business Permits	Ian Dyer	Ashley Centre	Per year	1,995	2,050	2.8%
Car Parking	Annual Business Permits	Ian Dyer	Ashley Centre (Blue Badge)	Per year	630	650	3.2%
Car Parking	Annual Business Permits	Ian Dyer	Hook Road	Per year	630	650	3.2%
Car Parking	Annual Business Permits	Ian Dyer	Hudson House	Per year	1,150	1,185	3.0%
Car Parking	Annual Residents Permits	Ian Dyer	Chessington Road	Per Year	340	350	2.9%
Car Parking	Annual Residents Permits	Ian Dyer	Hook Road	Per year	340	350	2.9%
Car Parking	Annual Residents Permits	Ian Dyer	Hope Lodge	Per year	340	350	2.9%
Car Parking	Annual Residents Permits	Ian Dyer	Hudson House	Per year	920	950	3.3%
Car Parking	Annual Residents Permits	Ian Dyer	Upper High Street (Existing users only)	Per year	630	650	3.2%
Car Parking	Miscellaneous	Ian Dyer	Dispensation permit for contractors	per vehicle per day (4-28 days)	5	5	0.0%
Car Parking	Miscellaneous	Ian Dyer	Dispensation permit for contractors and residents to carry out works subject to restrictions	per vehicle up to 3 days	20	20	0.0%
Car Parking	Miscellaneous	Ian Dyer	Hook Road Parker Card	Per card	15	15	0.0%
Car Parking	Miscellaneous	Ian Dyer	Lost parker card	Per card	15	15	0.0%
Car Parking	Miscellaneous	Ian Dyer	Lost Token - Ashley Centre, HL, TH	Per token	25	25	0.0%
Car Parking	Miscellaneous	Ian Dyer	Lost Token - Hook Road	Per token	10	10	0.0%
Environmental health	Cemetery - Planting	Rod Brown	Moulding/turfing	Per session	70	72	2.9%
Environmental health	Cemetery - Planting	Rod Brown	Plants - Summer and Winter	Per year	149	154	3.4%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	Any other row traditional - Non-resident	Per grave	3,444	3,496	1.5%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	Any other row traditional - Resident	Per grave	1,722	1,774	3.0%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	Butterfly lawn section (baby grave) - Non-Resident	Per grave	960	989	3.0%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	Butterfly lawn section (baby grave) - Resident	Per grave	960	989	3.0%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	Front row path traditional - Non-resident	Per grave	6,473	6,570	1.5%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	Front row path traditional - Resident	Per grave	3,237	3,334	3.0%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	Garden of Remembrance (cremated remains only) - Non-Resident	Per grave	1,077	1,093	1.5%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	Garden of Remembrance (cremated remains only) - Resident	Per grave	538	554	3.0%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	In pergola plot - Non-resident	Per grave	6,432	6,528	1.5%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	In pergola plot - Resident	Per grave	3,216	3,312	3.0%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	New lawn section - Non-resident	Per grave	2,971	3,015	1.5%
Environmental health	Cemetery - rights of burial - 40 years - Earthern graves	Rod Brown	New lawn section - Resident	Per grave	1,486	1,530	3.0%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 11ft (3.352m) - Non-Resident	Per grave	2,920	2,958	1.3%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 11ft (3.352m) - Resident	Per grave	1,286	1,324	3.0%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 2ft (0.609m) or less (cremated remains) - Non-Resident	Per grave	584	592	1.4%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 2ft (0.609m) or less (cremated remains) - Resident	Per grave	278	286	2.9%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 4ft (1.219m) or less (Child under 12 only) - Non-Resident	Per grave	834	845	1.3%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 4ft (1.219m) or less (Child under 12 only) - Resident	Per grave	380	391	2.9%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 5 or 7ft (2.133m) - Non-Resident	Per grave	1,972	2,000	1.4%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 5 or 7ft (2.133m) - Resident	Per grave	946	974	3.0%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 9ft (2.743m) - Non-Resident	Per grave	2,339	2,371	1.4%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Dug to 9ft (2.743m) - Resident	Per grave	1,063	1,095	3.0%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Over 11 ft (3.352m) - Non-Resident	Per grave	-	-	0.0%
Environmental health	Interments Monday to Friday	Rod Brown	Over 11 ft (3.352m) - Resident	Per grave	-	-	0.0%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 11ft (3.352m) - Non-Resident	Per grave	3,612	3,671	1.6%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 11ft (3.352m) - Resident	Per grave	1,992	2,051	3.0%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 2ft (0.609m) or less (cremated remains) - Non-Resident	Per grave	1,014	1,035	2.1%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 2ft (0.609m) or less (cremated remains) - Resident	Per grave	698	719	3.0%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 4ft (1.219m) or less (Child under 12 only) - Non-Resident	Per grave	1,411	1,438	1.9%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 4ft (1.219m) or less (Child under 12 only) - Resident	Per grave	923	950	2.9%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 5 or 7ft (2.133m) - Non-Resident	Per grave	2,584	2,631	1.8%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 5 or 7ft (2.133m) - Resident	Per grave	1,572	1,619	3.0%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 9ft (2.743m) - Non-Resident	Per grave	2,944	2,994	1.7%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Dug to 9ft (2.743m) - Resident	Per grave	1,680	1,730	3.0%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Over 11ft (3.352m) - Non-Resident	Per grave	-	-	0.0%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Over 11ft (3.352m) - Resident	Per grave	-	-	0.0%
Environmental health	Interments Saturday Service	Rod Brown	Walled graves	Per grave	-	-	0.0%

Service	Service Activity	Service Head	Description	Unit	2018/19	2019/20	% Change
					£	£	
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Butterfly Baby Grave Memorial Resident/Non Resident	Per item	105	108	2.9%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Butterfly memorial plaque - Resident/Non Resident	Per item	147	151	2.7%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Flat stone tablet - Non Resident	Per item	234	238	1.7%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Flat stone tablet - Resident	Per item	141	145	2.8%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Ground level surround - Non Resident	Per item	679	689	1.5%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Ground level surround - Resident	Per item	343	353	2.9%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Kerbs - Non Resident	Per item	348	353	1.4%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Kerbs - Resident	Per item	178	183	2.8%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Memorial in the Garden of Remembrance - Non Resident	Per item	343	348	1.5%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Memorial in the Garden of Remembrance - Resident	Per item	173	178	2.9%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Not exceeding 3ft 6ins (1.066m) - Non Resident	Per item	348	353	1.4%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Not exceeding 3ft 6ins (1.066m) - Resident	Per item	178	183	2.8%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Small memorial baby grave - Non Resident	Per item	208	211	1.4%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Small memorial baby grave - Resident	Per item	105	108	2.9%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Tablets/Vases etc - Non Resident	Per item	234	238	1.7%
Environmental health	Memorials	Rod Brown	Tablets/Vases etc - Resident	Per item	118	122	3.4%
Environmental health	Other cemetery charges	Rod Brown	Additional Inscription - Non resident	per inscription	212	215	1.4%
Environmental health	Other cemetery charges	Rod Brown	Additional Inscription - Resident	per inscription	106	109	2.8%
Environmental health	Other cemetery charges	Rod Brown	Issue of duplicate death grant	Per issue	101	104	3.0%
Environmental health	Stray Dogs	Rod Brown	Day - Return of dog to owner	Per case	130	130	0.0%
Environmental health	Stray Dogs	Rod Brown	Full costs Day - collection and kennelling	Per case	165	165	0.0%
Environmental health	Stray Dogs	Rod Brown	Full costs Night - collection and kenneling	per case	216	216	0.0%
Environmental health	Stray Dogs	Rod Brown	Night - Return of dog to owner	Per case	196	196	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Rats	Per case	60	60	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Mice	Per case	68	68	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Squirrels	Per case	90	90	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Wasps	Per case	60	60	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Fleas	Per case	68	68	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Cockroaches	Per case	75	75	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Bedbugs	Per case	105	105	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Textile pests	Per case	68	68	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Standard rate	Rod Brown	Stored product insects	Per case	90	90	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Rats	Per case	45	45	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Mice	Per case	51	51	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Squirrels	Per case	68	68	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Wasps	Per case	45	45	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Fleas	Per case	51	51	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Cockroaches	Per case	56	56	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Bedbugs	Per case	79	79	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Textile pests	Per case	51	51	0.0%
Environmental health	Pest Control - Benefit rate	Rod Brown	Stored product insects	Per case	68	68	0.0%
Environmental health	Street Trading	Rod Brown	Food licence / consent	Annual	710	735	3.5%
Environmental health	Street Trading	Rod Brown	Mobile food traders	Annual	710	735	3.5%
Environmental health	Street Trading	Rod Brown	Mobile food traders	6 months	380	450	18.4%
Environmental health	Street Trading	Rod Brown	Other licence / consent	Annual	710	735	3.5%

Service	Service Activity	Service Head	Description	Unit	2018/19	2019/20	% Change
					£	£	
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Hackney Carriage Drivers	Epsom & Ewell only - 3 years	300	300	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Hackney Carriage transfer fee on change of vehicle	Dual licensed	120	120	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Hackney Carriage transfer fee on change of vehicle	Epsom & Ewell only	85	85	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Hackney Carriage Vehicle	Dual licensed	240	240	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Hackney Carriage Vehicles	Epsom & Ewell only	300	300	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Knowledge Test (First)	Per test	80	80	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Knowledge Test (re-test)	Per test	80	80	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire - transfer fee on change of vehicle	Per transfer	85	85	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Drivers	Three years	255	255	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Drivers - restricted additional driver (e.g. Spouse)	Per driver licence	90	90	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - New 11+ vehicles	One year	405	405	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - New 1-2 vehicles	One year	395	395	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - New 3-5 vehicles	One year	395	395	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - New 7-10 vehicles	One year	405	405	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - Renewal - 11+ vehicles	One year	400	400	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - Renewal - 11+ vehicles	Five years	1,850	1,850	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - Renewal - 1-2 vehicles	Five years	1,050	1,050	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - Renewal - 1-2vehicles	One year	255	255	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - Renewal - 3-5 vehicles	One year	335	335	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - Renewal - 3-5 vehicles	Five years	1,500	1,500	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - Renewal - 6-10 vehicles	Five years	1,700	1,700	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Operators - Renewal - 6-10 vehicles	One year	375	375	0.0%
Environmental health	Vehicle licensing	Rod Brown	Private Hire Vehicles	One year	285	285	0.0%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Additional charges per flat	Per flat	12	13	4.2%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Additional charges per plot 11-25 plots	Per plot	25	25	2.0%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Additional charges per plot 2-5 plots	Per plot	37	38	2.7%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Additional charges per plot 26-75 plots	Per plot	18	19	2.8%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Additional charges per plot 6-10 plots	Per plot	31	32	3.3%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Additional charges per plot 76 plots and over	Per plot	12	13	4.2%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Changes to a development plot	Per plot	31	32	3.3%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Development Charge	Per application	110	115	4.5%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Flats redevelopment charge	Per application	183	190	3.8%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Naming of a property	Per property	31	32	3.3%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Renaming of a street	Per application	120	125	4.2%
Highways	Street Naming and Numbering	Ian Dyer	Renaming of a street additional charge per plot	Per plot	31	32	3.3%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Acupuncture, earpiercing and electrolysis - New (2 or more practitioners)	Per licence	280	350	25.0%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Acupuncture, earpiercing and electrolysis - New (small business - 1 practitioner)	Per licence	280	290	3.6%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Acupuncture, earpiercing and electrolysis - register additional named qualified practitioners	Per licence	71	85	19.7%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Acupuncture, earpiercing and electrolysis - Renewal (2 or more practitioners)	Per licence	71	85	19.7%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Acupuncture, earpiercing and electrolysis - Renewal (small business - 1 practitioner)	Per licence	71	85	19.7%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Replacement Registration/Badge	Per registration	21	22	2.4%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Scrap Metal Dealers - Collector New	Per Licence	335	345	3.0%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Scrap Metal Dealers - Collector Renewal (3 yr licence)	Per Licence	425	440	3.5%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Scrap Metal Dealers - Collector Variation	Per Application	335	345	3.0%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Scrap Metal Dealers - Site New	Per Licence	420	435	3.6%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Scrap Metal Dealers - Site Renewal (3 yr licence)	Per Licence	600	625	4.2%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Scrap Metal Dealers - Site Variation	Per Application	420	435	3.6%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Tattooing - Renewal	Per licence	240	260	8.3%
Licences	Other Licences	Rod Brown	Tattooing- Register Business Premises and all Listed Qualified Practitioners- New	Per licence	385	405	5.2%

Service	Service Activity	Service Head	Description	Unit	2018/19	2019/20	% Change
					£	£	
Licences	Premesis - Other	Rod Brown	Zoo Licence - 6 year renewal	Per licence	6,000	6,200	3.3%
Licences	Premesis - Other	Rod Brown	Zoo Licence - Grant (4 year licence)	Per licence	4,000	4,150	3.8%
Licences	Sex Establishment	Rod Brown	Sex establishments (Shops, sex encounter premises & cinemas) New Licence	Per licence	5,500	5,665	3.0%
Licences	Sex Establishment	Rod Brown	Transfer application	Per Application	315	330	4.8%
Licences	Sex Establishment	Rod Brown	Varation or renewal	Per licence	2,750	2,835	3.1%
Licences	Sex Establishment	Rod Brown	Varation or renewal no Hearing	Per licence	1,400	1,445	3.2%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Article 4 Direction	Per document	21	22	2.4%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Copy of planning permission (pre 1994 only)	Per document	21	22	2.4%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Copy of Section 106 (formerly S 52) agreements	Per document	18	18	2.9%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Listed Building Consent	Per note + site visit	-	350	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Listed Building Consent - Extensions	Per note + site visit	-	450	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Listed Building Consent - shopfront, adverts, householders	Per note + site visit	-	350	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	OTHER: Small minors - adverts, dropped kerbs, shopfronts, etc	Per note	-	150	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Planning Performance Agreements	Additional Meeting	-	2,500	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Planning Performance Agreements	1 -14 conditions	-	2,500	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Planning Performance Agreements	15+ conditions	-	5,000	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Planning Performance Agreements	per application	12,000	12,000	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Non-residential 1000-4999 sq m	Per meeting + note	1,150	2,000	73.9%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Non-residential 2500-4999 sq m	Per meeting + note	-	4,500	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Non-residential 5000+ sq m	Per meeting + note	2,510	7,500	198.8%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Non-residential 50-999 sq m	Per meeting + note	490	1,200	144.9%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Non-residential up to 50 sq m	Per written enquiry	120	125	4.2%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Residential 10-24 dwellings	Per written enquiry + note	1,150	3,000	160.9%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Residential 1-5 dwellings	Per meeting + note	670	1,200	79.1%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Residential 25-49 dwellings	Per written enquiry + note	-	4,500	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Residential 50+ dwellings	Per meeting + note	2,660	7,500	182.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Residential 6-9 dwellings	Per meeting + note	1,100	2,000	81.8%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Pre-App advice Residential Householder	Per written enquiry	100	125	25.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Telecoms - not PD	Per note	-	350	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Telecoms masts/equip 10+ sites	Per note	-	3,000	0.0%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	Tree Preservation Order (Full Copy)	Per document	26	27	3.8%
Planning and Building Control	Development Management	Ruth Ormella	TREES: TPO,CAT, Landscaping Plans	Per note (visit at officer's discretion)	-	150	0.0%
Waste Collection	Domestic bulk refuse disposal	Ian Dyer	10-12 items (5 sacks = 1 item)	Items	154	159	3.1%
Waste Collection	Domestic bulk refuse disposal	Ian Dyer	4-6 items (5 sacks = 1 item)	Items	77	80	3.2%
Waste Collection	Domestic bulk refuse disposal	Ian Dyer	7-9 items (5 sacks = 1 item)	Items	115	119	3.0%
Waste Collection	Domestic bulk refuse disposal	Ian Dyer	Over 12 items	Items - cost by quotation	9,999	9,999	0.0%
Waste Collection	Domestic bulk refuse disposal	Ian Dyer	Up to 3 items (5 sacks = 1 item)	Items	39	40	3.2%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Churches and Charities) Direct Debit	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 1100l garden waste bin	Per 1100l bin per annum	186	201	8.6%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Churches and Charities) Direct Debit	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 240l garden waste bin	Per 240l bin per annum	41	44	8.5%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Churches and Charities) Direct Debit	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 660l garden waste bin	Per 660l bin per annum	111	121	8.9%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Churches and Charities) Other Payment	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 1100l garden waste bin	Per 1100l bin per annum	204	221	8.4%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Churches and Charities) Other Payment	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 240l garden waste bin	Per 240l bin per annum	45	48	8.4%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Churches and Charities) Other Payment	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 660l garden waste bin	Per 660l bin per annum	122	133	8.8%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Domestic) Direct Debit	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of small garden waste bin	Per 140l bin per annum	30	33	9.0%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Domestic) Direct Debit	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of standard garden waste bin	Per 240l bin per annum	52	56	8.7%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Domestic) Other Payment	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of small garden waste bin - NEW SUBSCRIBERS	Per 140l bin per annum	33	36	8.8%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Domestic) Other Payment	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of standard garden waste bin	Per 240l bin per annum	57	62	8.8%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Flats and Schools) Direct Debit	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 1100l garden waste bin	Per 1100l bin per annum	236	257	8.8%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Flats and Schools) Direct Debit	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 240l garden waste bin	Per 240l bin per annum	52	56	8.7%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Flats and Schools) Direct Debit	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 660l garden waste bin	Per 660l bin per annum	160	154	-3.4%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Flats and Schools) Other Payment	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 1100l garden waste bin	Per 1100l bin per annum	287	282	-1.6%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Flats and Schools) Other Payment	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 240l garden waste bin	Per 240l bin per annum	57	62	8.8%
Waste Collection	Garden Waste (Flats and Schools) Other Payment	Ian Dyer	Fortnightly collection of 660l garden waste bin	Per 660l bin per annum	172	169	-1.7%

Service	Service Activity	Service Head	Description	Unit	2018/19	2019/20	% Change
					£	£	
Waste Collection	Provision of Bins for Events	Ian Dyer	1100 litre mixed recycling bin	Per bin, emptied once	-	3	0.0%
Waste Collection	Provision of Bins for Events	Ian Dyer	1100 litre refuse bin	Per bin, emptied once	-	10	0.0%
Waste Collection	Provision of Bins for Events	Ian Dyer	180 litre food recycling bin	Per bin, emptied once	-	1	0.0%
Waste Collection	Provision of Bins for Events	Ian Dyer	240 litre glass recycling bin	Per bin, emptied once	-	1	0.0%
Waste Collection	Provision of Bins for Events	Ian Dyer	240 litre mixed recycling bin	Per bin, emptied once	-	1	0.0%
Waste Collection	Provision of Bins for Events	Ian Dyer	240 litre refuse bin	Per bin, emptied once	-	3	0.0%
Waste Collection	Provision of Bins for Events	Ian Dyer	Delivery/collection of bins to/from event	One-off charge	-	20	0.0%
Waste Collection	Replacement Domestic Bin	Ian Dyer	Damaged by resident	Per bin	52	54	3.1%

This page is intentionally left blank

The current and proposed charges for Business and Resident permits are shown in the tables below.

Business Permits

Description	Current tariff (per year)	Proposed tariff (per year)	Change (£)	Potential net revenue	Change (%)
Ashley Centre	£1,995	£2,050	£55	£1,375	2.8%
Ashley Centre (Blue Badge)	£630	£650	£20	0	3.2%
Chessington Road	£630	£650	£20	N/A	3.2%
Depot Road (Existing Permit holders only)	£630	£650	£20	£583	3.2%
Ewell Court House (Existing Permit holders only)	£290	£300	£10	£17	3.4%
Hook Road	£630*	£650*	£20	£4,833	3.2%
Hudson House	£1,150	£1,185	£35	£671	3.0%
Upper High Street (Existing permit holders only)	£630	£650	£20	£833	3.2%

*Bulk discounts may be applied at officer's discretion

Resident Permits

Description	Current tariff (per year)	Proposed tariff (per year)	Change (£)	Potential net revenue	Change (%)
Adelphi Road	£120	£125	£5	£46	4.2%
Chessington Road	£340	£350	£10	£3,500	2.9%
Hook Road (Hope Lodge o/night)	£340	£350	£10	£108	2.9%
Hope Lodge (Hook Road during day - existing only)	£340	£350	£10	£8	2.9%
Hudson House	£920	£950	£30	£175	3.3%

The current and proposed charges for Parker Cards are shown in the tables below.

Description	Last Change	Current tariff (per year)	Proposed tariff (per year)	Change (£)	Change (%)
Hook Road parker card discounted rate	2017	£3.50 per day	£3.50 per day	£0	0%
Hook Road parker card	Apr-16	£15	£15	£0	0%
Lost parker card	Apr-16	£15	£15	£0	0%

The current and proposed charges for lost tokens are shown in the tables below.

Description	Last Change	Current tariff (per year)	Proposed tariff (per year)	Change (£)	Change (%)
Hook Road lost token	Apr-17	£10	£10	£0	0%
Ashley Centre lost token	Apr-17	£25	£25	£0	0%
Hope Lodge lost token	Apr-17	£25	£25	£0	0%
Town Hall lost token	Apr-17	£25	£25	£0	0%

Where time of entry can be proven then the lost charge will be £5 for the lost token plus the relevant parking charge.

The current and proposed charges for Parking Dispensation permits are shown in the tables below.

Description	Last Change	Current tariff (per week)	Proposed tariff (for up to 3 days)	Proposed tariff (For 4 to maximum 28 days)
Dispensation permit for contractors and residents to carry out works subject to restrictions	Apr-16	£20	£20	£5 per day

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

Agenda Item 8
Annex 3

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

REVENUE BUDGET 2019/20

Head of Service/Contact:	Lee Duffy, Chief Finance Officer
Urgent Decision?(yes/no)	No
If yes, reason urgent decision required:	N/A
Annexes/Appendices (attached):	None
Other available papers (not attached):	Budget Target Report to S&R Committee on 25 September 2018

Report summary

This report sets out estimates for income and expenditure on services in 2019/20.

Recommendation (s)

(1) That the Committee recommends the 2019/20 service estimates, for approval at the budget meeting of Full Council in February 2019.

1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy

1.1 The Medium Term Financial Strategy and Efficiency Plan aims to maintain the financial health of the Council whilst delivering the priorities in the Corporate Plan.

1.2 The Service Plan for the Corporate Priority "Managing Resources" includes service targets designed to maintain a balanced budget.

2 Background

2.1 Government reductions to the revenue support grant and welfare benefit changes continue to create pressure on Council finances and are likely to do so for the foreseeable future. The Council's budget strategy has been, as far as practical, to make operational and efficiency savings to minimise service reduction affecting residents.

2.2 For 2016/17 to 2019/20, Council agreed a four year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and Efficiency Plan to maintain the financial health of the Council whilst delivering the priorities in the Corporate Plan. The recommendation in this report is consistent with the MTFS.

2.3 The overall Council revenue budget target for 2019/20 was agreed by Strategy & Resources Committee on 25 September 2018 as follows:-

- Estimates should include options to reduce organisational costs by £406,000 in order to minimise the use of working balances and maintain a minimum working balance of £2.5 million in accordance with the MTFS;
- That at least £200,000 additional revenue is generated from an increase in discretionary fees and charges;
- That a provision for pay award is made of £280,000 that represents an increase to the staffing budget of 2.5%, 1% for cost of living and 1.5% for progression;
- That further savings and efficiencies be identified to address the budget shortfall of £113,000 in 2019/20;
- That £200,000 from the financial gain of being part of the Pilot for Business Rates is used to mitigate the potential payment of £625,000 to government for 'negative RSG'.

2.4 The figures in this report are final and are representative of the local government finance settlement. Any subsequent changes to service estimates should either be self-financing or produce a saving within the Committee's overall recommended budget.

2.5 Following the removal of 'negative RSG' in the provisional local government finance settlement, the Council has been able to reduce its reliance on funding from both New Homes Bonus and the one-off financial gain from the business rates pilot.

2.6 The service estimates for this Committee are to be included in the draft Budget Book 2019/20 that will be made available to all Councillors.

2.7 Estimates have been prepared on the basis that all existing services to residents are maintained.

2.8 No general allowance for price inflation has been utilised for the revenue estimates 2019/20. However, where the Council incurs contractual inflationary uplifts, budgets have been adjusted accordingly.

2.9 For pay inflation, a budgeted increase £280,000 has been allowed for within the MTFS.

2.10 The Council agreed a target to increase overall income from locally set fees and charges by a minimum of 3%, after making allowance for any further changes in service. Proposals have been included in a separate report on this agenda.

2.11 To allow the Council to determine the budget and Council Tax in February, the Committee estimates have been presented as follows:-

- The Budget Book contains the service estimates for 2019/20.
- All unavoidable cost increases and income reductions are reflected in the estimates.
- All operational savings identified to date are reflected in the base estimates.
- Recommended increases to fees and charges have been included within the Budget Book and the income estimates.
- All increases in charges are subject to approval by the Council.

3 Revenue Estimates 2018/19

3.1 Before considering the revenue estimates for 2018/19, this section provides a summary of the forecast outturn for the current financial year. Variations identified with on-going effects have been taken into account in preparing next year's budget.

3.2 The Council's probable revenue outturn at Q2 monitoring for all Committees in 2018/19 anticipates an adverse variance of £144,000. This would result in a contribution from working balances at year end of £144,000, assuming that this level of variance continues through to 31 March 2019. The Council's working balance currently stands at £3,348,000 before any contribution is made.

3.3 The probable outturn specifically for Environment and Safe Communities Committee only for 2018/19 is an adverse variance of £293,000, which is shown in the following table. The key reasons for the major variances are explained in the subsequent paragraphs.

Service Group	Published Budget 2018/19	Current Approved Budget 2018/19	Probable Outturn 2018/19	Probable Variance 2018/19
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Parking	(1,989)	(1,943)	(1,820)	123
Environmental Services	3,082	3,243	3,386	143
Planning & Building Control	607	615	622	8

Community Safety	101	78	62	(16)
Environmental Health	147	187	223	35
Environment & Safe Communities Committee	**1,948**	**2,180**	**2,473**	**293**

3.4 The current approved budget in the table above represents the published budget updated with authorised transfers of funds since the budget was approved in February 2018.

3.5 The adverse forecast variance within Car Parks of £123,000 is due to underachievement of income at the Ashley Centre, which is now projected to be £153,000 below budget. This is offset by a net favourable variance across all other car parks of £30,000. Income from car parks will continue to be monitored and any adverse variance relating to the temporary Plan E works will be funded from reserves in 2019/20. Should adverse variances persist beyond Plan E's completion, options for addressing the budget gap will be considered as part of next year's budget setting process.

3.6 Within Environmental Services, a net adverse variance of £167,000 is forecast within domestic waste, following a significant increase in comingled recycling gate fees. Gate fees have increased from £45 per tonne to £64, primarily due to the announcement from China in January 2018 that it would no longer import plastics for recycling, having previously been a major importer. As of 1 April 2019, in line with other Surrey borough councils, Surrey County Council will take control of Epsom & Ewell's recycling disposal. This budgetary pressure does therefore not feature in the 2019/20 budget for Environmental Services.

3.7 Also within Environmental Services, the income from Epsom market has a forecast adverse variance of £39,000. The adverse variance relating to temporary Plan E works will be funded from reserves in 2019/20. Should adverse variances persist beyond Plan E's completion, options for addressing the budget gap will be considered as part of next year's budget setting process.

3.8 The adverse variances within Environmental Services are offset by a number of favourable variances, the largest of which is a forecast over-achievement of income on Trade Waste of £38,000.

3.9 The adverse variance within Environmental Health is due an under-achievement of income by £44,000 within the cemetery. As a result of the limited number of remaining burial plots, the sale of future graves has been suspended. The ongoing cemetery extension scheme should see this income stream restored in future years.

3.10 The Committee's probable outturn (estimated net expenditure) for 2018/19 is included in the draft Budget Book on each service group page, with a detailed analysis of variations to budget. The outturn forecasts are all based on quarter two budget monitoring reports used by all managers.

4 Proposals for 2019/20 Budget

4.1 The service estimates are included in the draft Budget Book 2019/20, circulated to Councillors in January.

4.2 A summary of the Committee's revenue estimates for 2019/20 is set out below:

Service Group	Published Budget 2018/19 £'000	Base Position 2019/20 £'000	Variance £'000
Parking	(1,989)	(1,896)	93
Environmental Services	3,082	3,255	173
Planning & Building Control	607	545	(62)
Community Safety	101	114	13
Environmental Health	147	169	22
Total	**1,948**	**2,187**	**239**

4.3 The following table comprises a summary of the main changes to the Committee's proposed budget for 2019/20 compared with the published budget for 2018/19.

Environment & Safe Communities Committee	**Budget £'000**
Published Budget 2018/19	**1,948**
Variation in pay, pension (IAS19) & support service recharges	250
Increase in income from fees and charges	(218)
Operational efficiencies	(28)
Net increase in transport recharge	12
Car Park operational budgets including electricity, card payment processing fees and insurance	43

Net impact of SCC taking recycling responsibilities and reduced SWP funding	166
Sundry items	14
Base Position 2019/20	**2,187**

5 Financial and Manpower Implications

5.1 Consultation processes will be progressed should operational changes affect staffing levels or staff duties.

5.2 The draft Budget Book 2019/20 is highly detailed and therefore any questions or queries should be sent to relevant officers in advance of this Committee meeting wherever possible.

5.3 ***Chief Finance Officer's comments:*** Financial implications are contained within the body of this report.

6 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)

6.1 The Council will fulfil its statutory obligations and comply with its policy on equalities.

6.2 ***Monitoring Officer's comments:*** There are no direct legal implications arising from this report. However, decisions taken about the budget will impact the services which can be delivered. It is important that statutory services are appropriately funded, which the recommended budget seeks to achieve.

7 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications

7.1 There are no specific particular implications for Sustainability Policy or Community Safety arising out of this report.

8 Partnerships

8.1 Many services are provided by the Council without the direct involvement of other agencies. There is, however, an increasing role for partnership working with others to achieve mutually agreed objectives. The benefits and risks need to be assessed in each specific case to ensure that value for money is secured and the Council's priorities are delivered in the most efficient and effective manner.

9 Risk Assessment

9.1 In preparing the revenue budget estimates officers have identified the main risks facing the Committee in delivering services within the budget. These budgets will require careful management during the year.

Service	Risk	Budget Estimate 2019/20 £'000	Risk Management
Off Street Car Parking	**Medium to High:** Income from off street car parks is exposed to adverse weather and economic conditions that can have significant effect on outturn. Plan E traffic works may also impact carpark usage.	Total Budgeted Income £3,986k 1% change would affect income by £40k 5% change would affect income by £199k	Monthly monitoring and work analysing individual car park performance against target.
Operational Services	**Low:** The service is reliant on fuel and therefore susceptible to price rises.	Fuel budget across Op services is £307k 10% change would increase costs by £31k	Continuously monitor fuel costs and reduce fuel consumption where possible.
Cemetery	**Medium:** Numbers of burials are falling impacting the income level of the service.	Total Budgeted Income £464k A 10% reduction would result in shortfall of £46k income.	Promotion of service and diversification of services offered. The new extension works are due to start in the spring.
Building Control	**Low:** Private competition has impacted on the service in recent years with the market difficult to predict.	Total Budgeted Income £308k A 10% reduction would result in £31k shortfall against income budget	Monthly monitoring including work analysing income against target.

Development Control	**Low:** The uncertainty of single, large applications can impact significantly on income. Planning Performance Agreements are new so volume based on estimate	£538k income budget A 10% reduction would result in £54k shortfall of income	Monthly monitoring including work analysing income against target.

10 Conclusion and Recommendations

10.1 The Committee is asked to agree the service revenue estimates set out in the draft Budget Book 2019/20.

10.2 The Council will consider the budget at its meeting on 19 February 2019.

Ward(s) affected: (All Wards);

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Committee is asked to consider whether it wishes to pass a resolution to exclude the Press and Public from the meeting in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the business involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended) and that pursuant to paragraph 10 of Part 2 of the said Schedule 12A the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Agenda Item 11

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank