

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Report

Committee:	Universal Services Select Committee
Date:	10 September 2024
Title:	Report of Universal Services SP25 Working Group
Report From:	Chairman of the Universal Services SP25 Working Group

Contact name: Councillor Jackie Branson

Email: jackie.branson@hants.gov.uk

Purpose of this Report

1. The purpose of this report is to outline the work undertaken by the cross-party Working Group formed to scrutinise the approach and outcomes of the Stage 2 consultation in relation to Savings Programme 2025 proposals within the remit of the Universal Services Select Committee.
2. This report presents the recommendations of the Working Group for the Select Committee to take into account when pre-scrutinising the proposals under the Savings Programme 2025 being put forward for decision to Cabinet.

Recommendation(s)

The Universal Services Select Committee note:

3. That the cross party Working Group held four meetings between 5 January and 22 May 2024 and had the opportunity to discuss the consultation process and the consultation feedback.
4. That following this scrutiny the Working Group unanimously agreed that the Consultation had been a comprehensive process which had given residents the information and opportunity to make reasoned responses and that it provided the County Council with sufficient information to consider the impacts of the proposals on the residents of Hampshire.
5. The Working Group's observations, questions, and recommendations outlined in paragraphs 22 – 39 and considers these while scrutinising final proposals and formulating feedback and recommendations to Cabinet. In particular that:
 - In respect of the proposals to remove school patrol crossings that as part of any review care is taken to ensure the costs of introducing safety measures do not exceed any savings and that all necessary highways works to improve safety (such as new crossings) are in place before the related patrol is removed to reduce potential safety impacts. In addition, the Select Committee may wish to scrutinise potential impacts arising from the loss of

the social value of school crossing patrols over and above their traffic management function.

- In respect of the impacts relating to street lighting proposals that the County Council should when receiving requests to vary lighting in individual locations consider other factors such as personal security/safety and travel safety and not just consider specific crime or road accident statistical data in determining requests.
- That should HWRCs be closed that remaining ones do not also have reduced operating hours to avoid an accumulation of impact and that before final decisions are made the cost of closing and decommissioning sites should be fully scrutinised together with a detailed capacity plan for peak times and a highways impact and residents journey length and time assessment.
- For Countryside parking a business case should be prepared.
- That a further impact assessment on the passenger transport proposals (paragraph 30) should be considered by the Select Committee before scrutiny of these proposals and any recommendation is made to Cabinet.
- The need for a clear and simple communications strategy in respect of the Highways (Planned) Maintenance Reduction proposal and the reduction in winter services.

Executive Summary

6. The Universal Services SP25 Task and Finish Working Group was established by the Universal Services Select Committee in November 2023 to assist the Universal Services Directorate with the decision-making process in respect of its SP25 proposals and the associated Stage 2 Consultations. Specifically, the Group was established to oversee and scrutinise the approach and outcomes of the Stage 2 Consultation in relation to the Universal Services SP25 Proposals (as listed in paragraph 13 below).
7. This report provides a brief summary of the Working Group's early discussions while the consultation was ongoing, and a more detailed record of the Group's observations in relation to each of the seven Universal Services proposals. These form the basis of the Group's feedback and recommendations to the Universal Services Select Committee.
8. Specific observations, points, and questions were raised in relation to each of the seven proposals, and these will aid the Select Committee in considering final proposals. However, an overarching theme emerged relating to communication, and the need for clear and effective explanation of the County Council's final proposals, including their purpose, how they will be implemented, what impacts might arise, and how these will be mitigated wherever possible.

Contextual information

9. In October and November 2023, following a stage 1 consultation process on options for balancing the budget, Cabinet and County Council respectively approved savings proposals totalling £90.4m.
10. Through the Equality Impact Assessment process, it was identified that some of these proposals directly impacted residents and users of the services, and therefore a consolidated stage 2 consultation process for 13 of the proposals (totalling £17.5m) was launched at the beginning of 2024. The consultation sought to understand the potential impacts of each proposal in more detail, to consult on potential options and to clarify whether there may be other ways in which the savings could be made.
11. The responses received through the consultation will be used by directorates to inform the final recommendations that will be presented to Cabinet on 14 October 2024 for consideration, following scrutiny of the proposals by Select Committees.

The Working Group

12. The Universal Services Select Committee appointed a cross party Working Group at its meeting on 27 November 2023 to scrutinise the approach and outcomes of the Stage 2 Consultation in relation to proposals under the 2025 Savings Programme within this committee's remit. The Working Group was formed of the following Members:
 - Cllr Lulu Bowerman – until 23 May 2024 (Conservative)
 - Cllr Jackie Branson (Conservative) (Chair)
 - Cllr Debbie Curnow-Ford (Conservative)
 - Cllr Mike Ford (Conservative)
 - Cllr Tim Groves (Liberal Democrat)
 - Cllr Dominic Hiscock (Liberal Democrat)
 - Cllr Sarah Pankhurst (Independent)
 - Cllr Stephen Parker (Conservative)
 - Cllr Kim Taylor (Labour)
13. The Working Group had a Terms of Reference (see Appendix 1) and focused on the following savings proposals:
 - a) Proposals to reduce planned highway maintenance, with planned maintenance activity continuing at reduced levels until government funding allows it to be reinstated.
 - b) Proposals to reduce the cost of the highways winter service by reviewing current provision against statutory requirements and seeking innovations which can further reduce costs.
 - c) Withdrawal of all remaining funding on non-statutory public transport provision.

- d) Proposals to develop criteria to identify countryside carparks where charging could be introduced.
 - e) Proposals to extend the existing dimming and part-night streetlight switch-off time in residential streets, where appropriate and based on local evidence.
 - f) Proposals to review the School Crossing Patrol service to determine whether alternative safe measure could be put in place.
 - g) Proposals to review the existing 24 Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) service provision to inform a revised strategy for service delivery, taking account of best practice across the country and national guidance and enabling the provision of more modern, accessible sites. The revised service could include varying the opening hours of HWRCs, reducing the number of existing HWRCs, building new HWRCs or extending capacity of existing HWRCs, and/or introducing new charges for discretionary services at HWRCs.
14. The Working Group held its first meeting in January 2024 at which Members were briefed on the consultation timeline, papers, and content, and invited to suggest ways of promoting the consultation and further engaging residents and stakeholders. Further meetings were held in February, to review feedback to date, and in May to review the final responses and consider their implications for future proposals and recommendations to be made to the Universal Services Select Committee when pre-scrutinising the final recommendations to Cabinet. Members on the Working Group had the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the proposals set out in the consultation document and the findings from the consultation.

Meetings of the Working Group

15. At the Group's first meeting the finalised consultation documents were shared with the committee and the approach and timescales were outlined by the Director of Universal Services. It was acknowledged that it could have been more beneficial if the finalised documents could have been shared further in advance of the meeting to allow more reading time. It was confirmed that the consultation web page would display summaries of the various streams of questions as well as one overall set of questions, thus enabling residents to be selective about which areas they wished to provide feedback on. In addition, it was clarified that the FAQs section on the webpage would be updated throughout the consultation should residents raise issues not already covered. Finally, it was confirmed that all responses and comments would be reviewed and processed by the County Council's Insight and Engagement Team in a similar way to the Budget Consultation of 2023.
16. In the Group's second meeting, the Director of Universal Services provided an update on feedback to date. It was confirmed that the consultation had been shared amongst groups and forums as well as Parish and District Councils, and

that various press outlets had been approached to promote the consultation, including radio and newspapers rather than being exclusively publicised online.

17. On the 17 and 22 May 2024, the Group met to review the final consultation findings. The Director of Universal Services shared a presentation outlining the key findings in relation to each proposal. Members also had access to the full consultation feedback and raw data for more detailed scrutiny as required.
18. Members were reminded of the objectives and outcomes of the Group as set out in the Terms of Reference, as follows:

Objectives

- To support the Directorate with the approach to engagement and consultation with key stakeholder groups.
- To review feedback from engagement and formal public consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, in relation to the Directorate Stage 2 Consultations listed above.
- To consider and provide comment on impacts.

Outcomes

- To provide updates to the Universal Services Select Committee on the progress of the Stage 2 Consultations listed above.
- To provide feedback regarding the Stage 2 Consultation to the Directorate.
- To submit a report to the Universal Services Select Committee to be considered alongside any Officer Recommendations before the Committee for pre-decision scrutiny

The Consultation Process

19. The Group considered a form of wording with which to report back to the Select Committee on the consultation process and unanimously agreed with the following statement, that:

The Consultation has been a comprehensive process which has given residents the information and opportunity to make reasoned responses and that it provides the County Council with sufficient information to consider the impacts of the proposal on the residents of Hampshire.

20. Whilst members were supportive of the Consultation and engagement with the public, some members thought they would have benefitted from both having input at an earlier stage and from being able to feedback on the consultation content ahead of the documentation going live. One member also felt that some

discussion of availability of mitigations in relation to impacts should have been discussed in order to fully consider impacts and provide comments.

21. Some members also felt there should have been an option for respondents to 'Outright Reject' any proposals in the consultation, whereas others thought that the option provided to 'Strongly Disagree' covered this as a response.

Findings of the Working Group

22. Regarding the consultation feedback itself, the Group discussed the findings of each proposal in detail and made a number of observations specific to each, which are set out below. A recurring theme was that of communication, particularly in how proposed changes would be explained to the public. This was regarded as vital in the case of all the proposals for the following reasons:
 - a) Ensuring the public know what will change, why, and what to expect.
 - b) Clarifying the rationale – not only for proposals, but why they are being implemented in a particular way.
 - c) Explaining how consultation feedback and potential impacts have been taken into consideration and where possible mitigated.
 - d) Wherever possible reassuring the public and clarifying that changes and impacts will not be as far reaching as some may fear.
23. The remainder of this section considers each proposal in turn.
24. **Highways (Planned) Maintenance Reduction:** 88% of respondents disagreed with this proposal with 64% strongly disagreeing. Impacts identified within the HCC proposal document included the diminished resilience of the highway network in particular the ability to withstand the effects of winter weather.
25. Many residents' responses noted the already poor condition of the network and related to potholes. Officers assured the Group that budgets in relation to reactive and safety work would not be impacted by this proposal and that the main effect would be an increased length of time to undertake routine planned maintenance such as road resurfacing. Other impacts identified by residents included road safety, impacts to pedestrians, cyclists, disabled people and damage to private vehicles resulting in higher cost for them and the Council in dealing with and settling claims. Some alternative suggestions included the need for more central funding and greater scrutiny of contractor's work to deliver efficiencies and value for money.
26. Noting the high levels of opposition to this proposal, the Group agreed that it would be essential to stress that safety issues and other reactive work would continue to be prioritised. When presenting these proposals for scrutiny and decision, and especially for implementation, it would be key to communicate what kinds of activity will be reduced. It was suggested that examples could be

developed to help articulate the difference between planned and reactive maintenance, as well as the consequence of reducing or delaying this activity. It was further suggested that infographic resources could be useful in explaining this, and that as well as clarifying the change/reduction in activity and its likely impact, the County Council should be clear about which areas would be affected.

27. It was noted that the County Council has a complex methodology for establishing maintenance priorities via Asset Management principles. If the basic principles supporting this could be explained to members and residents, it would aid acceptance of this savings proposal.
28. Finally, it was noted that a possible mitigation to limit the saving could arise from more effective enforcement on landholders whose ground maintenance or drainage arrangements (or lack thereof) often impact the condition of the public highway, particularly in rural areas. Officers pointed out that this was already pursued rigorously, and it was suggested that the County Council might make more of this in communication with the public.
29. **Highways Winter Services:** This proposal seeks to reduce expenditure through reviewing the criteria used to determine which roads should be included in the Priority One Network for gritting and snow clearance and to align this with national policy. Again, the Group noted the high levels of opposition (60%) to this savings proposal, especially among older people, those with disability and mobility issues together with concerns expressed about the effect on rural areas. The Group agreed it would be important to emphasise that this aspect of the Highways Service has not been reviewed for many years, and that in the meantime there have been changes in weather and travel patterns which might necessitate (and enable) change as well as reducing budgets. A possible mitigation was suggested by way of the County Council working more closely with local communities to promote the use of grit bins, as many residents' concerns relate to the use of footways as much as/more than roads.
30. **Passenger Transport: The three proposals in this area include:**
 - a) **Withdrawing funding for bus services.** 76% of respondents disagreed with this proposal with only 15% in agreement. Strongest opposition came from users (90%) of the supported bus services. Impacts on both young and older people were identified by respondents with impact on access to education, isolation and mental health specifically highlighted. The group noted that rural communities and those with disabilities and with low incomes were most at risk of being negatively impacted.
 - b) **Withdrawing all funding for community transport.** 73% of respondents disagreed with this proposal with only 15% in agreement. Users of the service tended to strongly disagree (81%) with this proposal and in particular those in low incomes under £10,000. Disagreement (87%) was also high amongst organisations responding. The Group noted impacts would be particularly high amongst protected characteristics including on

older people, those with mental health issues together with rural users and the impact on public health isolation and wellbeing. The group acknowledged there would be additional impacts on charitable organisations providing services and that taken together with Adults Health and Social Care proposals some providers may face sustainability issues.

c) Withdrawing additional funding for the concessionary travel scheme.

This would mean Disabled Bus passes could not be used before 9:30 and Companion bus passes would cease. In addition, bus passes would not be accepted on some infrequently used services between 9:00 and 9:30. 68% of respondents disagreed with this proposal with only 21% in agreement. Identified impacts included the significant impact of disabled people and especially those requiring carer support or the need to use services before 9:30 to be able to continue to attend appointments and access medical services.

31. The Group noted the high level of opposition to these proposals and expressed concern about the potential impact on vulnerable members of the community, including older and younger people, and those with disabilities. There were particular concerns about the isolating impacts of these proposals. The Group stressed that the Select Committee should seek detailed information on the final proposals in respect of: 1) the likely impact on residents, especially those with protected characteristics, and 2) the interrelation between this proposal and other services provided by the County Council, especially Adults' Services and Children's Services.
32. The Group agreed that the Select Committee should seek assurance that public and community transport services were not cited as mitigation for any reductions to be made in other directorates, and vice versa. In particular, the impact on Home to School Transport should be considered. In addition, the Group noted that there will be children dependent on bus services to get to school who do not have a statutory right to Home to School Transport and may be adversely affected. The Group was advised that an assessment of these impacts and issues had been undertaken but were not given sight of the report.
33. **Countryside Car Parking Charges:** The Group noted the more even split between support and opposition for this proposal, with the balance held by those in support. The Group reviewed the impacts cited in the consultation responses and sought clarification that a business case would be prepared for every new charging proposal clarifying the charges, how compliance would be secured, how people would pay, and noting any potential issues and impacts (e.g. displaced parking) for consideration before implementation.
34. **Street Lighting:** The higher level of support for this proposal was noted, as were the concerns highlighted in relation to crime and the fear of crime. Of those disagreeing with the proposals safety impacts in relation to pedestrian safety and negative impacts on women and shift workers were identified as well as potential road safety. The Group noted that many older urban estates are designed with access to homes through back alleyways and paths and that

these residents may have a higher reliance on lighting for a sense of personal safety and accident/crime reduction.

35. Noting that the County Council has the ability to respond to requests to vary lighting levels in localities with specific requirements, the Group asked that as well as considering specific crime or road accident data in determining requests that other factors/representations be considered such as personal security/safety and travel safety (i.e. the avoidance of accidents) as much as those of crime. It was suggested that final proposals should be carefully cross referenced with local circumstances, e.g. local bus times, presence of bus stops, regular events, etc. In addition, the County Council should reach out to communities to ensure they know it is open to discussion and be willing to make adjustments where there is a strong case for them.

36. **School Crossing Patrols: There were two proposals relating to School Crossing Patrols.** Proposal 1 to remove School Crossing Patrols (SCPs) from crossing points considered to be already safe was disagreed with more than Proposal 2, which was to take measures to make unsafe crossings safe without a need for a SCP. 53% of respondents agreed with Proposal 2. The opposition to these proposals was noted, together with the concerns about impacts on safety, especially with regard to children. The Group noted the County Council's commitment to ensure safety when implementing this proposal and asked that any necessary measures to make crossings safe should be in place before a SCP was withdrawn.

37. The Group also expressed concerns about the expense of implementing safety measures in place of School Crossing Patrols. When scrutinising final proposals, it was suggested that the Universal Services Select Committee should seek assurances that this would not prove a false economy with savings offset by the prohibitive expense of providing crossings, etc. It was also suggested that the proposal could be better explained with clarification on how safety is determined. In addition, the social value of school crossing patrols over and above their traffic management function was noted, and it was suggested that the Select Committee may wish to scrutinise potential impacts arising.

38. **Household Waste Recycling Centres: A range of five proposals were subject to consultation:**
 - a) **Charges for discretionary services** The majority of respondents said they would not pay for discretionary services suggested. Those with higher incomes appeared to support the proposal more than those with lower incomes. Impacts identified included: charges for services would have a disproportionately greater impact on those with low incomes and those needing physical assistance such as the elderly or disabled.
 - b) **Alternative delivery models of HWRC services e.g. by other organisations.** 46% of respondents disagreed, 31% neither agreed or

disagreed and 21% agreed. Local Authorities that responded suggested that this proposal would not be viable for them to operate and comments indicated impacts could include a lack of a standard service causing confusion.

- c) **Changes types of waste accepted at HWRCs.** There was 71% disagreement with this proposal. Those disagreeing identified impacts of fly tipping and possible reduction in recycling. Officers provided information to the group that there was no evidence from other authorities that suggested altering services would lead to an increase in fly tipping.
- d) **Reducing opening days/hours.** Agreement and disagreement for this proposal was close at 44% and 41% respectively, with many respondents seeing this as a more acceptable alternative than closing HWRCs. Respondents identified impacts of fly tipping including landowners whose properties were being used to fly tip illegally. An impact on working households was identified if hours at weekends and evenings were reduced. Suggested mitigations included making sure that nearby HWRCs reduced hours on different days to keep a greater range of options open for residents. The Group was concerned that a reduction in opening hours would have an increased impact if there were also closures. Pursuing both options would exponentially increase impacts.
- e) **Reducing the number of HWRC sites.** 87% of respondents disagreed with this proposal, and the Group acknowledge the level of feeling and dissatisfaction with the proposal amongst residents. As well as fly tipping concerns other impacts identified by respondents included: longer journeys for residents which might disproportionately impact the elderly, disabled or those on low incomes, climate change environmental impacts, reduced recycling and capacity to cope with increased development

39. The very high level of opposition to this proposal was noted, and the Group raised the following key points and questions for the Select Committee's consideration when scrutinising final proposals:

- a) Has the cost of decommissioning sites (including breaking leasehold agreements) been considered, and will it be possible to include the cost implications in any proposals presented for scrutiny?
- b) It was noted that the existing booking system should yield considerable data in terms of use patterns on specific days. Will these be used to help finalise proposals so that capacity is established not just on a total visit basis but on a daily usage basis i.e. can remaining HWRCs cope at weekends and at other high demand times?
- c) If HWRCs are closed, will capacity be increased at remaining sites to meet peak demand times?
- d) How thoroughly will cumulative impact of closures and changed hours be modelled?
- e) Will proposals be assessed for impacts on queuing, traffic management, and highways safety taking into account the increase in demand at remaining sites?

- f) Has consideration been given to the impact on kerbside bins?
- g) How will adjusted opening hours be communicated?
- h) What impact will amended opening hours have on throughput and lorry movements?
- i) Where the potentially impacted HWRC sites are close to the County borders, will cross-border work or communications take place with neighbouring Authorities to mitigate any wider implications?
- j) Will proposals consider and allow for seasonality and account for changes in popularity throughout the year?

Equalities

40. To support the awareness and accessibility of the Future Services Consultation, a number of steps were taken by the County Council. This included:

- A comprehensive communications plan and a response monitor which tracked respondent demographics to enable further promotional activities to be undertaken in areas or groups of under-representation.
- A wide range of online and offline channels, with appropriate activities informed by a stakeholder analysis. This included significant levels of promotion on social media, targeted promotion to under-represented groups (identified by the response monitor), as well as more traditional channels such as paid for adverts in key printed newspapers, radio adverts, promotion within further and higher education establishments, posters at bus stops/on buses and banners at HWRCs.
- The full range of existing County Council channels were also used, including residents e-newsletters and the website, and County Councillors were encouraged to raise awareness of the consultation with their local residents.

Residents who would be directly affected by the adult social care charge and passenger transport proposals were also written to personally, and a range of outreach work was undertaken with district councils regarding the homelessness support service proposal.

- An Information Pack containing details of the proposals, and a consultation Response Form were developed in standard and EasyRead formats. These were published on-line and made available in paper format, with other languages and formats available on request. Online documents were compatible with screen readers and 'read aloud' technology.

41. Equality impacts identified through the consultation will inform the final SP25 Savings Programme proposals and will be reflected within the Equality Impact

Assessments that will form part of the Decision reports to Cabinet.

Conclusions

42. The cross-party Working Group provided an opportunity for Members to scrutinise the 2025 Savings Programme proposals and present its findings to the Select Committee for consideration when the Select Committee decides what to recommend to Cabinet regarding the proposals.

REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:

Links to the Strategic Plan

Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity:	Yes
People in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives:	Yes
People in Hampshire enjoy a rich and diverse environment:	yes
People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:	Yes

Other Significant Links

Links to previous Member decisions:	
<u>Title</u> MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY UPDATE AND SAVINGS PROGRAMME TO 2025 SAVINGS PROPOSALS https://democracy.hants.gov.uk/documents/s113505/2023-11-09%20County%20Council%20-%20Item%2009%20Part%20I%20MTFS%20Savings%20Proposals.pdf	<u>Date</u> <u>9/11/2023</u>
Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives	
<u>Title</u> None	<u>Date</u>

Section 100 D – Local Government Act 1972 – background documents	
<p>The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)</p>	
<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
None	

EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

Equality Duty

The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by or under the Act with regard to the protected characteristics as set out in section 4 of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation);
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (see above) and persons who do not share it.

Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular to:

- The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- Encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

Equalities Impact Assessment:

See paragraph 41 of the report for more detail on equalities.

Appendix 1

UNIVERSAL SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE TASK AND FINISH WORKING GROUP ON THE DIRECTORATE SP25 PROPOSALS THAT REQUIRE A STAGE 2 CONSULTATION.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

43. Introduction

- a) This Task and Finish Working Group is being established to assist the Universal Services Directorate with the decision-making process in respect of its SP25 proposals and the associated Stage 2 Consultations.

44. Role and Purpose of the Task and Finish Working Group

- a) The Task and Finish Working Group is a working group of the Universal Services Select Committee and is appointed in accordance with the Constitution of Hampshire County Council.
- b) The Task and Finish Working Group's purpose is to oversee and scrutinise the approach and outcomes of the Stage 2 Consultation in relation to the following SP25 Proposals:
 - I. Proposals to reduce planned highways maintenance, with planned maintenance activity continuing at reduced levels until government funding allows it to be reinstated;
 - II. Proposals to reduce the cost of the Highways winter service by reviewing current provision against statutory requirements and seeking innovations which can further reduce costs;
 - III. Withdrawal of all remaining funding on non-statutory public transport provision;
 - IV. Proposals to develop criteria to identify countryside car parks where charging could be introduced;
 - V. Proposals to extend the existing dimming and part-night streetlight switch off time in residential streets, where appropriate and based on local evidence;
 - VI. Proposal to review the School Crossing Patrol service to determine whether alternative safe measure could be put in place; and
 - VII. Proposals to review the existing 24 Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) service provision to inform a revised strategy for service delivery, taking account of best practice across the country and national guidance and enabling the provision of more modern, accessible sites. The revised service could include varying the opening hours of HWRCs, reducing the number of existing HWRCs,

building new HWRCs or extending capacity of existing HWRCs, and/or introducing new charges for discretionary services at HWRCs.

- c) The Task and Finish Working Group will assist the Directorate by giving feedback on the overall approach to engagement with key stakeholder groups and will review and provide feedback on the presentation of the outcome of the Stage 2 Consultation process.
- d) The Task and Finish Working Group will provide a report on its activities to the Universal Services Select Committee for consideration.

45. Objectives

- a) To support the Directorate with the approach to engagement and consultation with key stakeholder groups.
- b) To review feedback from engagement and formal public consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, in relation to the Directorate Stage 2 Consultations listed above.
- c) To consider and provide comment on impact assessments.

46. Outcomes

- a) To provide updates to the Universal Services Select Committee on the progress of the Stage 2 Consultations listed above.
- b) To provide feedback regarding the Stage 2 Consultation to the Directorate.
- c) To submit a report to the Universal Services Select Committee to be considered alongside any Officer Recommendations before the Committee for pre-decision scrutiny.

47. Method

- a) The Task and Finish Working Group will meet with Directorate Officers to consider the evidence from the presentation of the outcome of the Stage 2 Consultation process leading to recommendations for decisions on the proposed savings proposals.
- b) At each meeting, the Task and Finish Working Group will provide feedback to Officers on the stated objectives of the review.
- c) Where the Task and Finish Working Group reasonably requires further information in order to meet its objectives such information will be provided by Officers.

48. Membership

- a) The Task and Finish Working Group shall be a cross party group made up of Members of the Universal Services Select Committee (consisting of a total of 8

Members: 5 Conservative Group, 2 Liberal Democrat Group, and either 1 Labour Group or 1 Independent Group).

49. Meetings

- a) The Working Group will hold an initial meeting in advance of the consultation going public to review the finalised consultation document and to also understand the timeline for reviewing and making recommendations on the presentation of the outcomes of the planned formal public consultation.
- b) At its initial meeting the Task and Finish Working Group shall appoint a Chairman from among its Members.
- c) The Working Group will meet once during the consultation to provide feedback on the process of the consultation, including coverage and key stakeholders group engagement
- d) The Task and Finish Working Group will meet after the Stage 2 Consultation to provide feedback to Officers on the presentation of the outcome of the Stage 2 Consultation process and to agree its report to the Universal Services Select Committee. The content of the Report will be agreed by consensus.
- e) Meetings of the Task and Finish Working Group can be either in person, remote or hybrid.
- f) Following the submission of the Report, the Task and Finish Working Group will cease to exist.

50. Code of Conduct

- a) Elected Members of the Working Group shall comply with the Hampshire County Council's Code of Conduct for Members.