

Universal Services

Name of SP25 proposal:	SP25 Proposal Reference:
Waste Services – Household Waste Recycling Centres	EIA – US05 Directorate Universal Services

EIA writer(s) and authoriser

No.		Name	Department	Position	Email address	Phone number	Date	Issue
1	Report Writer(s)	Paul Laughlin / Tara Cartledge	Universal Services	Waste Contracts and Programmes Manager / Project Manager			30/04/2024	2
2	EIA authoriser	Patrick Blogg	Universal Services	Director – Universal Services			15/04/2024	2
3	EIA Coordinator	Patrick Poyntz-Wright	Universal Services	Capital and Democratic Services Manager			14/04/2024	2

Section one – information about the service and service change

<p>Service affected</p>	<p>Household Waste Recycling Centres</p>
<p>Please provide a short description of the service / policy/project/project phase</p>	<p>The County Council has the largest network of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) in England, operating 24 HWRCs in the Hampshire area where residents can reuse, recycle and dispose of waste. Residents are able to reuse, recycle and dispose of a wide variety of material streams including bulky wastes and mixed residual waste in bagged form.</p> <p>The County Council has a statutory responsibility to provide places where residents can deposit household waste (e.g. household contents arising from the day-to-day running of a household) at no charge.</p> <p>There is no legal definition of how many facilities need to be provided and how/where they should be located, only that sites should be ‘reasonably accessible at reasonable times’.</p> <p>The HWRC service cost is split into two parts, those that cover the cost of managing the sites (20%) and the cost of disposing of the material that is deposited (80%). The booking system, initially introduced during COVID-19 pandemic, has been retained following public support for the benefits that it provides in terms of site operations and reduced congestion.</p>
<p>Please explain the new/changed service/policy/project</p>	<p>Following the Future Services Consultation, it is recommended that the County Council implements the closure of HWRCs in Tier 3 and Tier 4. It is recommended to do so on a structured, phased basis to achieve the required savings and move towards a Legal Minimum Service Level.</p> <p>Other proposals were considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introducing charging for discretionary services

- changes to the types of waste accepted at HWRCs
- reducing the opening days and/or hours of HWRCs

These proposals were rejected as they do not meet the required minimum savings level or the legal minimum service level at this time.

Implementing alternative delivery models was another proposal considered. Whilst site closures of Tier 3 and Tier 4 is recommended, the County Council remains open, where practicable, to considering approaches from external organisations interested in alternative delivery models for any Tier 3 or Tier 4 site at risk of closure, so long as the Council can still make the required saving and does not retain an administrative or legal responsibility linked to its statutory waste disposal obligations.

Engagement and consultation

The County Council's *Making the Most of your money budget* consultation (2024-2026) sought residents' and stakeholders' views on strategic options for funding the Authority's budget gap. Where applicable, detailed proposals for making savings were subject to further, more detailed 'stage two' consultation (detailed below).

Has any pre-consultation engagement been carried out?

No

Describe the consultation or engagement you have performed or are intending to perform.

Describe who was engaged or consulted. What was the outcome of the activity and how have the results influenced what you are doing? If no consultation or engagement is planned, please explain why.

A full stage 2 public consultation known as Future Services was conducted for 12 weeks between January and March 2024. In total, 10,750 responses were received to the HWRCs section of the consultation, 54 of these were from elected representatives and 72 from organisations.

The consultation response indicated an overall strong level of opposition to all proposals put forward. Whilst the theme of opposition throughout was clear, when respondents were asked if they had alternative suggestions of how we could meet the minimum savings levels, feasible suggestions were not received. The feedback has been fully considered in the recommendations made and balanced against the requirement to move towards a legal minimum service level.

Section two: Assessment

Carefully and consciously consider the impacts of the proposed change.

Consider at this point whether the assessment is of impacts on staff or service users. If it is both the impacts may be contradictory for each group (negative for staff but positive for customers, or vice versa). Consider completing two assessment tables (one for staff and one for customers) and providing one equality statement for both groups.

If the proposed change is expected to have a positive, neutral (no impact) or negative (low, medium or high) impact on people in protected characteristics groups or those who may be impacted by poverty or rurality. Indicate the impact by entering the risk score in the relevant column in the table below.

If an overview assessment of due regard is appropriate, please go to box 2.

Table 1 Impact Assessment [add ✓ to relevant boxes)

Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative - low	Negative - Medium	Negative - High	Affects staff, public or both?
Age			✓			Public
Disability			✓			Public
Gender reassignment		✓				Public
Pregnancy and maternity		✓				Public
Race		✓				Public
Religion or belief		✓				Public
Sex		✓				Public
Sexual orientation		✓				Public
Marriage & civil partnership		✓				Public
Poverty			✓			Public
Rurality			✓			Public

Table 2 Geographical impact

Does the proposal impact on a specific area? Consider the demographic data of the locations.

Area	Yes / no
All Hampshire	✓
Basingstoke and Deane	
East Hampshire	
Eastleigh	
Fareham	
Gosport	
Hart	
Havant	
New Forest	
Rushmoor	
Test Valley	
Winchester	

Section three: Equality Statement

For all characteristics marked as either having a neutral or low negative impact, challenge your assessment - carefully consider the protected characteristics, if necessary, review the Inclusion and Diversity eLearning, discuss with an EIA co-ordinator.

Table 3 Consideration of and explanation for neutral or low negative impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having neutral or low negative impact
Age	<p>LOW NEGATIVE: 27% of consultation respondents highlighted this characteristic as being affected by this proposal. There is a possible requirement for site users to travel further to sites, which may impact on older residents that experience difficulties with movement or are unable to travel longer distances.</p> <p>Although it is recognised there would be some impact on those less able to travel through age, disability, poverty, or through living in rural areas, the assessment considered this could be minimal. The options proposed would still provide a service within the parameters advised by the WRAP non statutory guidance, with almost all households still within a 20 minute driving distance, and 93% within seven miles. HWRC network provision in Hampshire would be considered in its entirety to ensure the best geographical coverage and optimal service in the circumstances and move towards a Legal Minimum Service Level provision. This should help mitigate some of the impacts on groups noted above.</p>
Disability	<p>LOW NEGATIVE: 20% of consultation respondents highlighted this characteristic as being affected by this proposal. There is a possible requirement for site users to travel further to sites, which may impact on residents that experience difficulties with movement or are unable to travel longer distances.</p> <p>Although it is recognised there would be some impact on those less able to travel through age, disability, poverty, or through living in rural areas, the assessment considered this could be minimal. The options proposed would still provide a service within the parameters advised by</p>

	<p>the WRAP non statutory guidance, with almost all households still within a 20 minute driving distance, and 93% within seven miles. HWRC network provision in Hampshire would be considered in its entirety to ensure the best geographical coverage and optimal service in the circumstances and move towards a Legal Minimum Service Level provision. This should help mitigate some of the impacts on groups noted above.</p> <p>The proposed Tier 1 and Tier 2 sites that would remain, are the largest and most modern split-level HWRCs which are generally easier to access and use, including for people with disabilities, which should help mitigate the impact on people with this protected characteristic.</p>
Poverty	<p>LOW NEGATIVE: 16% of consultation respondents highlighted this characteristic as being affected by this proposal. Although this is not a statutory protected characteristic, there is a possible requirement for site users to travel further to sites and incur increased travel costs, which may impact on those residents on lower income disproportionately.</p> <p>Although it is recognised there would be some impact on those less able to travel through age, disability, poverty, or through living in rural areas, the assessment considered this could be minimal. The options proposed would still provide a service within the parameters advised by the WRAP non statutory guidance, with almost all households still within a 20 minute driving distance, and 93% within seven miles. HWRC network provision in Hampshire would be considered in its entirety to ensure the best geographical coverage and optimal service in the circumstances and move towards a Legal Minimum Service Level provision. This should help mitigate some of the impacts on groups noted above.</p>
Rurality	<p>LOW NEGATIVE: 32% of consultation respondents highlighted this characteristic as being affected by this proposal. Although this is not a statutory protected characteristics, rural residents may be more likely to have to make longer journeys to access the service.</p>

	<p>Although it is recognised there would be some impact on those less able to travel through age, disability, poverty, or through living in rural areas, the assessment considered this could be minimal. The options proposed would still provide a service within the parameters advised by the WRAP non statutory guidance, with almost all households still within a 20 minute driving distance, and 93% within seven miles. HWRC network provision in Hampshire would be considered in its entirety to ensure the best geographical coverage and optimal service in the circumstances and move towards a Legal Minimum Service Level provision. This should help mitigate some of the impacts on groups noted above.</p>
Other	<p>NEUTRAL: It is not anticipated that the impacts of this change would disproportionately affect other protected characteristics.</p>

For all characteristics marked as either having a 'medium negative' or 'high negative', please complete table 4:

Table 4 Explanation and mitigation for medium and high impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having medium or high negative impact	Is there a Geographical impact? If so, please explain - use list above to identify geographical area(s)	Short explanation of mitigating actions
---------------------------------	---	--	--

--	--	--	--

If you have specified mitigations as part of the assessment, now consider reviewing the impact severity/risk assessment.

For all characteristics marked as either having a positive impact please explain why in table 5.

Table 5 Consideration of and explanation for positive impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having positive impact

Further actions and recommendations to consider:

- If neutral or low negative impacts have been carefully considered and identified correctly, the activity is likely to proceed.
- If medium negative or high negative have been identified:
 - The policy, service review, scheme or practice may be paused or stopped
 - The policy, service review, scheme or practice can be changed to remove, reduce or mitigate against the negative impacts.
 - Consider undertaking consultation/re-consulting¹.
 - If all options have been considered carefully and there are no other proportionate ways to remove, reduce, or mitigate - explain and justify reasons why in the assessment.
 - Carry out a subsequent impact severity assessment following mitigating actions.

Box 1

Please set out any additional information which you think is relevant to this impact assessment:

Although it is recognised there would be some impact on those less able to travel through age, disability, poverty, or through living in rural areas, the assessment considered this could be minimal. The options proposed would still provide a service within the parameters advised by the WRAP non statutory guidance, with almost all households still within a 20 minute driving distance, and 93% within seven miles. HWRC network provision in Hampshire would be considered in its entirety to ensure the best geographical coverage and optimal service in the circumstances and move towards a Legal Minimum Service Level provision. This should help mitigate some of the impacts on groups noted above.

The proposed Tier 1 and Tier 2 sites that would remain, are the largest and most modern split-level HWRCs which are generally easier to access and use, including for people with disabilities, which should help mitigate the impact on people with this protected characteristic.

Box 2

If appropriate, (i.e., it is immediately evident that a full EIA is not necessary) please provide a short succinct assessment to show that due regard has been given and that there is no requirement for a full EIA: