

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
APPENDIX 7 to Draft Cabinet Report

Purpose of this appendix

1. The purpose of this appendix is to provide Cabinet with further detail of the Savings Programme 2025 (SP25) proposal on **Household Waste and Recycling Centres (HWRCs)**. Additionally, it will detail the specific recommendations relating to this proposal for Cabinet approval as part of the overarching decision report '**Savings Programme to 2025 Revenue Savings Proposals**'.

Recommendations

That Cabinet approves the following recommendations:

2. To note the outcome of the 2024 Future Services Consultation in relation to the proposals on the future of the Household Waste and Recycling Centres (HWRCs) network.
3. To approve the approach for the removal of up to £1.6 million budget provision for waste and resource management as detailed within this report to move the service towards a Legal Minimum Service Level (LMSL) taking into account statutory obligations and statutory and non-statutory guidance.
4. To implement closure of HWRCs in Tier 3 and Tier 4 (as set out in Table 1, Paragraph 23) on a structured, phased basis to achieve the savings and move towards a Legal Minimum Service Level.
5. That authority is delegated to the Director of Universal Services in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Waste to progress and make any necessary arrangements to implement these decisions, including the phased approach to the closure of Tier 3 and Tier 4 HWRCs and further consideration of the viability and legal basis of any alternative operating models for any closed sites.

Executive Summary

6. Hampshire County Council provides 24 Household Waste Recycling Centres across the county to fulfil its statutory duty to provide places where residents can deposit their bulky household and garden waste. This is a greater network than anywhere else in the UK.
7. With an annual budgeted cost of over £10m, the HWRC service was included as a key area for potential budget savings in the County Council's Future Services Consultation in January 2024. Five options were consulted on: introducing charging for discretionary services where legally possible,

implementing alternative delivery models, changing the types of materials accepted at HWRCs, reducing site opening days/hours, and rationalising the size of the network.

8. Other than the requirements of the Environmental Protection Act (1990) there are no further statutory guidelines on the way in which the HWRC service should be provided. Non-statutory guidance on recommended drive times/distances and optimal site capacities is available and was used to inform the proposals in the Consultation.
9. To support the proposed options, each HWRC was reviewed and ranked against a set of criteria to determine the most efficient and effective sites in the network. From this, each HWRC was allocated to one of four tiers with Tier 1 the largest, most cost-effective strategic sites through to the smallest, least value-for-money sites in Tier 4.
10. More than 10,000 consultees responded to the HWRC part of the Future Services Consultation. There was general dissatisfaction with the proposals, particularly those related to reducing the current service provision. Key themes highlighted for concern included a perception that fly-tipping would increase as a result of the proposals (with an associated offset against intended savings), increased air pollution from longer journeys, and a worry that alternative sites would be unable to cope with increased demand.
11. The proposals set out within this appendix originally accounted for a minimum of £1.2m of this total, however following consultation and further analysis, including consideration of the move towards a legal minimum service level, the potential savings proposal has been revised to up to £1.6m. This budget saving is achievable through the recommendation proposed and would still provide an HWRC service within the non-statutory guidelines.
12. While it is understood that the HWRC service in Hampshire is a well-regarded and well used service, the County Council is clear in its position that only full closures of the HWRCs in the proposed Tiers 3 and 4 can achieve the necessary move towards a legal minimum service level, as other options such as charging for household waste are prohibited in legislation, and changes to the service and/or reducing opening days/hours are insufficient on their own or in combination to move the services towards that level.
13. While the recommended closure of the HWRCs in the proposed Tiers 3 and 4 would clearly result in a significant reduction in the current provision, the proposal would still ensure provision in Hampshire is within the legal duty and recommended guidelines outlined in the non-statutory advice. From reviewing site booking and performance data, it is also considered that the remaining sites would still be able to meet the expected demand. It is anticipated that closures would commence from Summer 2025 onwards on a phased, planned basis.

14. While implementation of these proposals is further developed and ahead of any proposed closures, 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.

Contextual information

15. Hampshire County Council, as a Waste Disposal Authority (WDA), has a duty under the Environmental Protection Act 1990¹ to arrange for places for residents to deposit their household and garden waste at no charge.
16. The HWRC network in Hampshire is the largest in England with 24 sites of different sizes, accessibility and levels of efficiency, costing more than £10 million per year to operate. In 2022/23, Hampshire residents made 2.1 million bookings to deposit almost 120,000 tonnes of household waste across the network.
17. Hampshire County Council also has a mutual arrangement with Southampton City Council and Portsmouth City Council, which sees their HWRCs managed through the same contract, and allows Hampshire residents to use their HWRCs and vice versa. The HWRCs at City Depot, Southampton and Paulsgrove, Portsmouth were not included in the SP25 proposals.
18. An agreement is also in place with Dorset and West Sussex councils to allow their residents to access Hampshire HWRCs in return for an annual financial contribution.

Summary of service area proposals

19. The Future Services consultation proposed to reduce the amount of money the County Council spends on its HWRC network by a minimum of £1.2 million each year as it moves towards a legal minimum service level.
20. The consultation proposed a range of options that could allow the County Council to operate within this reduced budget, whilst continuing to provide a sustainable, cost-effective and fit for purpose HWRC service for the residents of Hampshire in the context of ongoing budget pressures. The options were:
 - introducing charging for discretionary services
 - implementing alternative delivery models

¹ [1] legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/43/contents

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

21. A programme of targeted site closures would deliver the most significant savings, potentially contributing up to £1.6 million to the County Council’s budget, and supporting the objective to move towards legal minimum service level. This is because a smaller network of HWRCs would have lower site running costs. We have assumed that waste treatment costs would remain the same, as we would expect to continue to handle a similar volume of waste through a reduced number of sites.

22. To help determine how this proposal could be implemented, a detailed evaluation of the current network was conducted, which assessed each HWRC objectively against a consistent range of criteria using population and performance data already held by the County Council, GIS mapping information, and supported by non-statutory guidance on HWRC provision (see paragraph 28 below for more information). This included:

- the number of households within 7 miles driving distance
- the amount of waste a) received by the site, b) diverted from landfill and c) the ability for nearby sites to handle this volume if the site were to close
- site capacity, and the demand for usage
- the distance to the next nearest site in the event of site closures
- flooding risks
- site performance and efficiency (percentage of waste recycled and diverted from landfill, and the cost of managing each site)
- site layout (whether the site is split or single-level, and the size and accessibility).

23. The results of the evaluation allocated each HWRC into one of four tiers (see Table 1):

- Tier 1 sites are newer, larger sites which are fit for current and future purpose.
- Tier 2 sites are those in strategic locations, which may require some investment to remain fit for purpose in the future.
- Tier 3 sites are smaller sites which would require more extensive investment to remain suitable in the future.
- Tier 4 sites are the smallest sites which provide the poorest value for money to run.

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
Andover	Alton	Aldershot	Alresford

Basingstoke	Efford	Bordon	Bishops Waltham
Eastleigh	Farnborough	Casbrook	Fair Oak
Gosport	Havant	Hedge End	Hartley Wintney
Segensworth	Netley	Marchwood	Hayling Island
Waterlooville		Petersfield	
Winchester		Somerley	

Table 1: Proposed allocation of HWRCs by tier

24. The feedback to the consultation has been helpful in contributing to informing the County Council's view about the optimum operating model that offers the best value for money as it moves towards a legal minimum service level, while also making the service more financially sustainable. It is clear that the service is well regarded by residents, however a balance must be struck to offset the significant savings the County Council is required to make to set a balanced budget. It is recognised that in isolation, and in some cases combined, the majority of these options would not deliver the originally stated minimum of £1.2 million in annual savings, nor would they move us significantly towards a legal minimum service level. Additionally, most options or combinations thereof, do not move the service towards delivering a legal minimum service level.
25. The cost of providing HWRCs is split into two parts, the cost of managing the sites (20%) and the cost of disposing the material that is deposited (80%). The cost of disposal is dependent on what and how much residents throw away, whereas the burden of management costs is more directly controllable by the Council.
26. Reducing the HWRC service towards a legal minimum service level would contribute towards addressing the County Council's budget deficit of £175 million from April 2025.

Legal, financial and performance implications

27. Hampshire County Council, as a Waste Disposal Authority (WDA), has a duty under the Environmental Protection Act (1990) to arrange for places for residents to deposit their household and garden waste at no charge. However, the legislation does not indicate how many HWRCs should be provided.
28. By law Hampshire County Council must ensure that HWRCs are reasonably accessible to residents at reasonable times. Whilst the law does not specify what 'reasonable' means, the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) provides non-statutory guidance to Local Authorities, outlining best

practice provision for HWRC networks². Its guidance states that HWRCs should ideally support no more than 120,000 residents or 50,000 households, and that in urban areas most households should ideally be within seven miles or driving time of 20 minutes (urban) to 30 minutes (rural) in “good traffic” for the “great majority of residents”. The WRAP Guidance also refers to the National Assessment of Civic Amenity Sites (NACAS) report (2004) which advised that a site should not manage more than 17,250 tonnes of waste inputs each year. None of the proposals put forward in the consultation, on their own or combined, would lead to the County Council exceeding these thresholds based on expected and projected demand. Therefore, it was considered that all the recommendations outlined in the consultation would still offer a reasonable level of service.

29. As a Waste Disposal Authority, the County Council is subject to other legislation in respect of management of Household Waste This includes a duty to comply with proposals in the Environment Act (2021) and clarified in May 2024 in the Government’s responses to their Simpler Recycling consultations³. These Simpler Recycling proposals do not directly affect HWRCs. However, they should increase the amount of recyclable household waste collected at kerbside thereby freeing up space in residents’ residual waste bins.
30. The County Council has a duty under the National Parks and Countryside Act 1949 (as amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023). This requires the County Council to seek to further the purposes of the National Park when considering proposals that relate to, or affect, land within a National Park. In this instance, the relevant purposes are of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the areas and of promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of those areas by the public.
31. The County Council recognises its duty in respect of the National Parks and continues to seek to further their relevant purposes through its services. This proposal will have a neutral impact on this duty as residents would still have reasonable access to waste facilities in line with WRAP non-statutory guidance, and there is no evidence to corroborate a view that criminal acts of fly-tipping and other environmental harm would directly increase as a result of any service changes. Additionally, across the waste service, there are a number of proactive high profile work programmes that seek to further the purposes of the national parks as per the duty, for example, the County Council’s waste prevention initiative Smart Living, and the Hampshire Fly-Tipping Partnership.

² wrap.org.uk/resources/guide/household-waste-recycling-centre-hwrc-guide

³ [Summary of responses and government response - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

32. The cost of providing the HWRC service is around £10 million per year. As outlined above, this cost is split between service provision and managing the contract, and processing of the waste delivered. Table 2 summarises the estimated cost savings associated with the five options consulted on.

Savings proposal	Level of savings	Ability to move towards the LMSL threshold
Introducing charging for discretionary services	Minimal	No
Implementing alternative delivery models	Saving of up to c.£100,000 per site	No
Changes to the types of waste accepted at HWRCs	Up to £500,000 based on the most expensive waste streams such as wood and 'DIY' type waste	No
Reducing the opening days and/or hours of HWRCs	One hour less per day £300,000 Two hours less per day £600,000 Three hours less per day £900,000	None of the proposed options are sufficient to move towards LMSL in isolation.
Reducing the number of existing sites	Closure of Tier 4: £500,000 Closure of Tier 3 and 4: £1,600,000	No Yes

Table 2: Summary of anticipated savings by proposal

33. In the case of the first three options, quantifying exact savings levels is difficult as there are several ways in which those options could be delivered. In the case of discretionary services, further investigation on the types of service to be provided and the level of margin to be applied would be required. As noted in the consultation document, any change to the delivery model or the types of material would require further detailed examination to ensure the County Council was still meeting its statutory responsibilities, meaning that the options for restricting certain waste streams may be restricted. In the case of DIY waste types, it has been clarified by the Government in 2023 that authorities may no longer impose a charge for such wastes, while all other household waste is exempt from applying a charge. Nonetheless, it is clear that these options would not deliver the proposed savings in isolation and would need to be combined with others.

34. Attempting to achieve savings through a reduction in opening hours alone would result in a severely restricted service that would only be open for a few hours per day, and this would be unlikely to satisfy the legislative requirement to make HWRCs 'reasonably accessible'. Due to the largely franchised model that the management contractor uses to operate the service, it is also likely that severely restricted or redistributed opening times across the whole existing network of 24 sites may make the sites less economically viable to manage by independent sub-contractors, and thereby potentially increasing the management fee charged to the Council. It is clear therefore that rationalising the current network by reducing the number of sites is the only feasible option to deliver the move towards a Legal Minimum Service Level.
35. It is important to note that, despite the high cost of provision, the HWRCs achieve a high level of performance with more than half of waste delivered being recycled or reused. To some extent, performance is difficult to manage as waste inputs can be affected by seasonality and weather (e.g. a warm, wet summer will result in higher volumes of green waste than a long, dry summer), however the sites are very efficient and site managers are incentivised by the Management Contractor to divert as much waste as possible from landfill. The County Council is confident none of the options put forward in the consultation, would negatively impact this performance.

Future Services Consultation – Approach

36. This was one of 13 proposals included within the 'Future Services Consultation', which sought to understand the potential impacts of each proposal in more detail, to consult on the potential options being considered, and to clarify whether there could be other ways to deliver the savings.
37. An overview of the approach to the Future Services Consultation is set out within paragraphs 17 to 24 of the draft Cabinet report, including the approach taken to communicating and promoting the consultation (informed by a stakeholder analysis) to invite respondents to share their views on some or all of the proposals.
38. Stakeholder mapping was conducted prior to the commencement of the consultation, engaging pertinent individuals within the Universal Services Directorate to ascertain and identify, as fully as possible, all relevant parties that may be impacted by the proposals. Through this process, particular emphasis was placed on incorporating insights gleaned from past consultations on the HWRC service in 2014 and 2016 using both experiential knowledge and resident feedback. The engagement approach identified a diverse array of stakeholders across multiple sectors, including neighbouring Local Authorities that access the Hampshire HWRC network, and local and national bodies concerning waste and resource management and legislative and regulatory provision.

Future Services Consultation – Feedback

Key groups/ demographics that responded to the HWRC Consultation

39. In total, 10,750 responses were received to the proposals regarding the HWRC service. The full summary report of results can be accessed [here](#). Of these:
- **10,533 were submitted using the Response Form (54 of these were from elected representatives and 72 from organisations)**
 - **217 were ‘unstructured’ responses, such as via letter or email (15 of which were from elected representatives and 32 from organisations).**
40. Respondents completing the Response Form were asked which HWRC site they most frequently used, with approximately two thirds of respondents mainly visiting a proposed Tier 3 or Tier 4 site, which were put forward for closure as one of the options. Of the 9,943 respondents who indicated on the Response Form which site they used most often:
- 1,822 respondents mainly visit a proposed Tier 1 site (17%)
 - 940 respondents mainly visit a proposed Tier 2 site (9%)
 - 5,057 respondents mainly visit a proposed Tier 3 site (51%)
 - 1,955 respondents mainly visit a proposed Tier 4 site (20%)
 - 169 respondents (2%) mainly visited the HWRCs at Portsmouth or Southampton. (the remaining respondents did not indicate which type of site they used).
41. While this might suggest that Tier 3 sites are the most used, this does not correlate with booking data which clearly demonstrates that Tier 1 and Tier 2 sites receive the most users with approximately 920,000 and almost 500,000 bookings respectively (2022/23 data). In the same period, Tier 3 received approximately 420,000 bookings and Tier 4 170,000 bookings. The consultation results could suggest that the majority of responses have therefore come from users more concerned and having a stronger opinion with their usual site being potentially at risk of closure.
42. Additionally, respondents came from the following age groups (based on the 9,699 who provided their age in the Response Form:
- Aged under 25: 54 (1%)
 - Aged 25 to 44: 1,615 (17%)
 - Aged 45 to 64: 4,274 (44%)
 - Aged 65 or over: 3,756 (39%)

Summary of HWRC Consultation results

43. Respondents completing the Response Form were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the following proposals to make savings from the HWRC service. (Respondents were asked to indicate preferences from strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree or disagree, strongly agree, agree or don't know). In summary, when excluding "don't know" responses, the levels of agreement with the proposals resulted in a sliding scale as follows:
- 44% of respondents agreed with the proposal to reduce opening hours and days to achieve savings
 - 35% agreed with the introduction of charging for discretionary service
 - 21% agreed with alternative delivery models
 - 14% agreed with the proposal to change the types of waste accepted at sites
 - 8% were in agreement with the proposal to reduce the number of sites.
44. A breakdown of the views on each of these proposed changes is shown below. Please note that, where levels of agreement and disagreement with the proposed changes are shown, these are calculated excluding 'don't know' responses.

a) Introducing charges for discretionary services

45. Generally, respondents encompassing all proposed tiers and age groups indicated an average 50% disagreement and 35% agreement overall with this proposal. The district with the highest opposition to implementing discretionary services was Gosport with 59%. Those most in favour were Test Valley and/or residents generally living in rural areas. Elected representatives agreed overall by 60%. When asked about the types of services people would pay for:
- Over half of respondents indicated they would not pay for any of the proposed discretionary services if offered.
 - 26% would pay for a more convenient slot (it should be noted that this is equivalent to charging for access which is currently prohibited by law).
 - 25% would pay for assistance.
 - 15% would pay for disposable items.
46. Some open text comments included support for an access charge: "The sooner legislation is passed enabling councils to charge for HWRCs the better. I suspect that most people would be willing to pay for the convenience of using a HWRC." Others expressed their disagreement to any barriers to accessing the HWRCs: "*These sites are hard enough to access now we have to book a slot. Stop looking at charging to use them.*"

b) Implementing alternative delivery models

47. Overall, 21% agreed and 46% disagreed with implementing alternative delivery models. The district with the highest opposition to implementing alternative delivery models was Rushmoor with 53%. Most in favour was Basingstoke with 33%.
48. Where respondents have indicated their agreement with this proposal, they have stated this could be a positive alternative to site closures. Some are supportive of charitable organisations or private companies potentially running the sites. Where disagreement was expressed, comments included concerns about the service being less efficient, for example in relation to missing out on economies of scale with individual site management as opposed to the service being managed collectively. Local Authorities who responded and also disagreed with the proposal stated they did not believe it would be viable for them to manage a HWRC.

c) Changing the types of waste accepted at HWRCs

49. This proposal was not supported by a majority of respondents; 14% agreed and 71% disagreed. Elected representatives agreed more than average at 26%, as did residents of Havant at 19% and proposed Tier 4 site users at 17%. There was higher disagreement amongst users of proposed Tier 2 HWRCs (74%), as well as residents of East Hampshire, Fareham, Gosport, and Rushmoor (74% each).
50. Those who disagreed with the proposal to change the types of waste accepted at HWRCs commonly mentioned potential impacts on fly tipping: *We should be increasing the type of recycling the centres take not reducing services. I can't believe how little is currently recyclable. In addition I do think this will lead people to dump their waste*". Those who indicated agreement described sympathy with the Council's financial situation: *"The sheer scale of the savings you need to make (notwithstanding the fact that there is no information given about other areas in which savings could - possibly more justifiably - be made) means you should do all of these things to the fullest extent"*.

d) Reducing the opening days and/or hours of HWRCs

51. Overall disagreement for this proposal was 41%, compared with 44% who agreed, with notable views on this proposal including:
- Respondents that mainly use a proposed Tier 2 site were most likely to disagree with this proposal at 51%.
 - Conversely, respondents that mainly use a proposed Tier 4 site were more likely to agree overall at 56%.
 - Users of proposed Tier 1 and Tier 3 HWRCs were less clear in their views, with proposed Tier 1 sites users indicating 43% agreement against

44% disagreement, and proposed Tier 3 site users indicating 43% agreement against 42% disagreement.

52. In terms of regional variances, Havant residents agreed most clearly at 71% (against 20% disagreement), with Test Valley and Winchester residents also showing higher agreement (48% for both) compared with disagreement (35% and 37% respectively). Conversely, residents in Fareham disagreed the most at 49% (compared with 40% agreement). Where respondents disagreed there were also suggestions that, if opening days or hours are reduced, needs of working people should be considered: *“A lot of people work so it makes sense to open afternoon and early evening in the summer and full days at weekend.”* The main reason for agreement was viewing it as a more agreeable option to site closures: *“Please charge us more in council tax to keep the dump open, maybe reduce opening times and hours but we cannot lose this facility.”*

e) Reducing the number of sites

53. Similar to changing the types of waste accepted at sites, this proposal was also unpopular with 87% disagreement overall. Around 8% were in agreement. When broken down, the results indicated the following:
- Disagreement was higher amongst users of proposed Tier 3 and Tier 4 sites (94% and 95% respectively).
 - In contrast, disagreement was lower (but still higher than the proportion indicating agreement) amongst users of proposed Tier 1 and Tier 2 sites (69% and 77% respectively).
 - Residents from East Hampshire were more likely than average to disagree at 94%.
 - Basingstoke residents expressed the highest level of agreement of all districts at 19%.
 - 85% of elected representatives, and the same proportion of organisations, disagreed.
54. Comments provided indicated that respondents were most agreeable with changing opening hours and days as an alternative to closing sites. Lobbying for new charges, or introducing discretionary charges were also regularly mentioned by those who disagreed with the proposed site closures. Others again expressed concern about an increase in Fly-Tipping, the impacts on rural communities and increased car pollution:
- *“Closure of sites will come with increased fly tipping and costs of cleanup there.”*
 - *“The drive to Alton is on smaller roads and would significantly increase carbon footprint and my journey there due to the roads is often in excess of 30 mins.”*

55. Among the small proportion who agreed with site closures, respondents frequently mentioned recognition of the need for the service to contribute to the savings required by the County Council, and the need to balance savings across different services:
- *“Although I like the convenience of having Bishops Waltham site nearby, I understand the need to save money and travelling to Hedge End would not put me off taking items to the recycling centre. I also believe that other proposals to withdraw money from public transport and homelessness are more important to reject.”*
 - *“If Tier 4 sites are running at a loss and require huge investment, then it makes little sense to keep these open.”*
56. Hampshire respondents were also asked a series of other questions, firstly to indicate whether it was felt that the County Council had identified the right criteria to use when categorising the HWRC sites into proposed tiers.
57. Of those with a view on the criteria used to propose tiers for HWRCs, 63% felt the existing criteria were the correct ones to designate a site to a particular tier. When comparing agreement across users of proposed tiers, agreement was highest amongst proposed Tier 1 users (81%) while proposed Tier 4 users were most likely to disagree (53%). Basingstoke residents agreed above the average with the criteria used at 78%. Residents in Hart and Havant had the highest levels of disagreement with 44%.
58. Those respondents who felt that the criteria proposed were not the correct ones to use, were asked what other criteria they thought should be considered. There were 2,258 responses to this question. Generally, respondents repeated criteria that had already used in the consultation such as suitability of next nearest sites and existing site usage. Other suggestions included:
- Impact on Fly-Tipping and environmental crime (41%)
 - Environmental impact of closure (16%), including concerns about having to travel further (especially for those with limited access to transport), air pollution because of increased mileage and impacts on roads with more traffic. There was also a concern that sites that remained open could experience excessive demand due to overspill from closed sites.
59. Respondents were also asked if reduced opening days and/or number of sites were to be implemented, which of the following options would they prefer:
- Closing as few sites as possible, with a reduction in opening days/hours at the remaining HWRCs was broadly the most popular option across different groups, but more so with people who visit a proposed Tier 3 or Tier 4 site (86% and 87% respectively). Residents in East Hampshire indicated the greatest support for this option with 85%.
 - 85% of elected representatives selected ‘closing as few sites as possible, with a reduction in opening days/hours).

60. The next option to close some sites alongside some reduction in opening days/hours received 10% support overall, with 5% support from those using a proposed Tier 4 site and 19% for those using a proposed Tier 1 site. Basingstoke residents conveyed the highest support for this option but still at only 18%.
61. Closing more sites with no reduction in days/hours only received 3% of support overall. East Hampshire and New Forest residents supported this the least with just 1%. Basingstoke and Fareham residents were more in support but still at only 8%.
62. Respondents were then asked to indicate which options they would prefer if the County Council was to reduce opening days and/or hours. Options included reducing opening hours at all sites but with HWRCs still open every day or closing HWRCs on certain days of the week but with no change to their opening hours on the other days.
63. There was slightly more support (53%) for ‘closing HWRCs on certain days of the week, but with no change to their opening hours on the other days’ across all characteristics. In terms of how this was supported across the proposed tiered system, the results were as follows:

Proposed tier	Support day closures with no change to opening hours	Support reduced opening hours with no day closures
1	51%	38%
2	47%	40%
3	53%	39%
4	61%	33%

Table 3: Consultee responses regarding preference for day closures or reduced opening hours.

64. Respondents were asked if they had any views on the impacts these proposals could have, or alternative suggestions as to how the County Council can deliver its HWRC service more efficiently or at a lower cost. There were 3,602 responses to this question. The impacts mentioned most frequently were:
- Increased Fly-Tipping (83%) – the concern was accentuated at proposed Tier 1 sites (90%) and to a lesser extent at proposed Tier 4 sites (73%). Elected representatives indicated this more frequently than average at 93% with organisations closely following at 90%.
 - There was a concern among some respondents that savings may be offset by increased costs elsewhere (40%).
 - Environmental impacts (33%) – with slightly above average concern at proposed Tier 3 and Tier 4 sites.

- Impacts on protected characteristics (17%) – this concern was particularly highlighted by organisations and elected representatives.

65. As detailed above, generally there was a strong level of opposition to the proposals outlined. However, whilst some expressed interest in the possible future operation and use of some sites there were no feasible alternative suggestions put forward that would achieve the level of savings proposed. Rather, the perceived negative impacts of changes to the current service level were more frequently made by respondents. Under the category of alternative suggestions, 1,432 respondents suggested alternative ways in which the County Council could deliver its HWRC service more efficiently or at a lower cost. The main suggestions were to:

- Change existing HWRC network (37%) – 71% was suggested by organisations, the remaining characteristics were generally average.
- Find other sources of funding (36%) – 73% of elected representatives suggested this.
- Reduce other services or costs (21%).
- Reduce landfilling rates (14%).
- Improve waste services (9%).

66. Further comments to this question saw 3,048 responses:

- Disagreement with HWRC proposals (39%) – 50% of organisations highlighted this. This was particularly acute in responses from district and borough authorities in Hampshire which highlighted that any changes to the HWRC service, particularly full site closures, could inadvertently result in some diversion of waste materials to kerbside bins which could then impact on the service provided by WCAs. However, the advent of Simpler Recycling will increase the amount of recyclable wastes collected at the Kerbside and in doing so will free up capacity in the residual (black bag) bin, which will reduce the need for residents to sometimes take excess black bag waste to the HWRC.
- Fly-tipping is an issue (23%) – this was a recurring theme throughout the consultation and shared across all characteristics.
- Alternative HWRC is too far away (22%) – this is slightly less of a concern for respondents in urban areas.

67. Table 4 below summarises the main concerns and impacts raised.

Key themes/concern mentioned by consultees	Response and/or mitigations proposed
--	--------------------------------------

<p>Diversion of waste and impact on WCA kerbside collections</p>	<p>Changes to the HWRC service, particularly full site closures, could lead some residents to seek to place greater quantities of waste materials usually taken to HWRCs to kerbside residual bins.</p> <p>However, the introduction of the Government's Simpler Recycling proposals, while having no direct impact on the HWRCs, will increase the amount of recyclables collected at Kerbside and thus will free up capacity in the residual (black bag) bins, which will reduce the need for residents to take any excess black bag waste to the HWRC.</p>
<p>Increased Fly-Tipping on public and private land</p>	<p>It is often suggested that changes to HWRC services could lead to an increase in fly tipping. However, where other local authorities have closed sites or reduced opening hours there is no evidence to suggest this is true. Fly-tipping is a criminal offence. Our experience in Hampshire suggests that Fly-Tipping is mainly carried out by criminal organisations looking to avoid charges for disposal, rather than householders.</p> <p>Regardless of any decision on HWRCs, we will continue to focus on ways to reduce fly tipping, such as through the Hampshire Fly-Tipping Strategy and Action Plan which we are delivering in partnership with a number of private and public sector organisations.</p>
<p>Savings from closures/rationalisation may be offset by increased costs elsewhere (e.g. increased Fly-Tipping as above)</p>	<p>The County Council has a £175m budget gap for 2025/26, and must, therefore, move towards a legal minimum service level to address this. It is therefore necessary that all possible options for reducing budget are explored. Hampshire provides more HWRCs than any other county, and significantly above non-statutory guidelines on provision. As above, experience from other local authorities does not suggest an increase in Fly-Tipping as a result of any changes.</p>
<p>Negative impact on air pollution and climate change through increased/longer car journeys</p>	<p>The booking system has already encouraged residents to think more carefully about using the HWRCs and how often by making best use of their booking. Non-statutory guidance advises that households are generally within seven miles distance of an HWRC, and these proposals still ensure 93% of residents are within this parameter.</p>

Increased negative impact on rural areas	The majority of HWRCs are not located in rural areas so the impact of any changes to the service is not anticipated to be substantial.
Impacts on protected characteristics, particularly age, disability and poverty	<p>By the very nature of the services that the County Council provides, there are inevitably changes that impact those people with protected characteristics.</p> <p>Overall, the impact was assessed as minimal. This impact could be reduced if a site user had the option to request support from friends and family. Alternatively, site users could make the best use of visits to reduce trips or consider utilising options such as kerbside collections for materials such as garden waste.</p> <p>The recommendation to close proposed Tier 3 and Tier 4 sites also means that the remaining sites available in Tier 1 and Tier 2 would be much better equipped to meet the needs of those with protected characteristics such as age and disability. This is because HWRCs in Tier 1 and Tier 2 are newer, modern, fit for purpose split level sites without steps and are generally easier to access and use.</p>
Reduced number of HWRCs will cause unreasonable congestion at those that remain open.	The booking system in place since 2020 manages customer demand through the day and has largely eliminated queues at all sites. The majority of sites are not currently fully booked throughout the week. The County Council has undertaken modelling to consider where waste from a closed site may be diverted and to evaluate whether there is sufficient capacity in the remaining sites to manage demand.
Increased domestic burning of waste	Instances of burning domestic waste in gardens is not understood to be a prevalent trend. The Environmental Protection Act (1990) specifies that householders have a duty not to dispose of waste in a way that could pollute the environment or be harmful to health. Burning waste other than green waste or untreated wood may be both a statutory nuisance and an offence in law.

Table 4: Proposed mitigations to key themes and concerns expressed by respondents

68. As part of the wider Future Services Consultation Response Form, respondents were also asked for any other comments, or suggestions as to how the County Council could deliver savings to reduce the £132 million budget deficit by 2025. The top 10 comments which related to HWRCs were:
- I. The proposals could potentially encourage fly tipping and/or burning of waste. 48% responded with this viewpoint.
 - II. 38% noted their disagreement with the proposals generally.
 - III. Proposals could have a negative impact on car users/roads and cause congestion. (19%).
 - IV. Reduce opening hours to avoid requirement for closures – already an option as detailed earlier in the report. (15%).
 - V. Charge a fee/introduce selective charging to access a site (14%). As was stated in the supporting evidence of the consultation, despite the County Council lobbying central Government since 2015, Waste Disposal Authorities (WDA's) such as the County Council, are not legally permitted to support the HWRC service by charging a small fee (e.g. £1) for public access. If the law changed, this could be introduced in future to help cover service costs. "Selective charging" has been considered as part of the implementing discretionary services proposal in the consultation.
 - VI. Proposals could have a negative financial impact on residents. (8%)
 - VII. Make the system more efficient (7%). Efficiency of the network addressed in supporting evidence in consultation.
 - VIII. The proposals could have environmental impacts (7%)
 - IX. The proposal to close sites could put pressure on other sites/ services (3%) This has been addressed in the supporting evidence when we have examined in detail the impacts of tonnage and cost diversion to other sites when some HWRCs are closed.
 - X. Invest more/increase service (3%). As per the contextual information to the Future Services consultation, the County Council has no choice but to move forward with Legal Minimum Service Levels due to ongoing rising costs and reductions in funding provided by central government.
69. Consultees were also asked to consider if the impacts they had mentioned related specifically to any protected characteristics or issues. There were 3,501 responses to this question, of which the top characteristics/issues highlighted were:
- Age 27%
 - Disability 20%
 - Despite not being protected characteristics the County Council also assesses the impact on Rurality and Poverty. Rurality was highlighted 32% of the time and poverty 16% of the time. In addition, Environmental impact was highlighted 59% of the time.

70. As outlined above, the main environmental concerns identified were concerns about increased air pollution arising from longer vehicle journeys, and a perceived negative impact on levels of Fly-Tipping. Rurality was also noted as an issue, however the majority of HWRCs are not located in rural areas so the impact of any changes to this service is not anticipated to be substantial. More detail on equalities and climate change considerations is included below from paragraph 93.

71. Finally, respondents were asked what HWRCs they currently use and which sites they would potentially use in the event of closures. In the majority of cases, respondents identified a larger site nearby (usually Tier 1 or Tier 2) as an alternative HWRC in the event their usual site was unavailable. This correlated with the modelling undertaken by the County Council to support the development of the options outlined in the consultation document. In some cases, however, where respondents mainly use a proposed Tier 3 or 4 site, they then selected another tier 3/4 site as an alternative. Around a quarter of respondents stated they would not use another site (this was larger in the case of Somerley but possibly reflects the high number of Dorset residents that regularly use this site). Table 5 below summarises the responses of users of proposed Tier 3 and Tier 4 sites. Where a tier 3 or 4 site was selected as an alternative, this is shown in Bold italics.

Most commonly used HWRC	Alternative HWRC	Not sure	Would not visit any
Aldershot	Farnborough (60%)	10%	27%
Alresford	Winchester (54%) Alton (22%)	11%	16%
Bishops Waltham	<i>Fair Oak (38%)</i> <i>Hedge End (30%)</i> Segensworth (10%)	18%	12%
Bordon	Alton (40%) <i>Petersfield (37%)</i>	15%	21%
Casbrook	Eastleigh (38%) Southampton (10%) Winchester (15%)	25%	15%
Fair Oak	<i>Bishops Waltham (32%)</i> Eastleigh (41%) <i>Hedge End (40%)</i> Winchester (10%)	8%	11%
Hartley Wintney	Basingstoke (27%) Farnborough (52%)	12%	13%

Hayling Island	Havant (71%)	8%	20%
Hedge End	Bishops Waltham (15%) Eastleigh (18%) Fair Oak (40%) Netley (20%)	18%	11%
Marchwood	Southampton (44%)	23%	24%
Petersfield	Bordon (32%) Havant (10%) Waterlooville (25%)	19%	21%
Somerley	Efford (9%)	37%	42%

Table 5: Consultee responses regarding which alternative HWRC they would consider using if their regular site closed.

Other forms of stakeholder responses

Petitions

72. The County Council received a number of petitions. These included one in opposition to the potential closure of Hartley Wintney and Aldershot HWRCs, of which there was 1,847 confirmed signatories, and one from the New Alresford vicinity which drew 68 signatures. Additionally, petitions were received in relation to Hayling Island HWRC which had 3,325 signatures, and regarding Bordon HWRC which received 3,316 signatories.

Expressions of Interest

73. A number of informal expressions of interest were also submitted to the County Council in relation to the proposed option of alternative delivery models and the future use of any HWRC sites if closed. These would be carefully considered where relevant following the approval and subsequent implementation of any recommendations. Only where any and all financial liability with regards to the operation of the site has been removed from the County Council would these be considered. Should any expression of interest be progressed then these sites would be outside of the County Council's jurisdiction, and our statutory duties as waste disposal authority would not be applied. Further detailed legal evaluation would be needed to scope these options if they were taken forward.

Unstructured responses

74. A number of unstructured responses were received in addition those submitted on the Response Form. The vast majority referred to the same issues and concerns highlighted by consultation respondents, in particular

concerns about impacts on Fly-Tipping and climate change. It is often suggested that changes to HWRC services such as charges, reduced opening hours, or closures would lead to an increase in fly tipping. However, where other local authorities have closed sites or reduced opening hours there is no evidence to suggest this is true. Our experience in Hampshire suggests that Fly-Tipping is mainly carried out by criminal organisations looking to avoid charges for disposal, rather than householders. Regardless of any decision on HWRCs, we will continue to focus on ways to reduce fly tipping, such as through the Hampshire Fly-Tipping Strategy and Action Plan which we are delivering in partnership with a number of private and public sector organisations.

75. All unstructured responses were reviewed and, where appropriate, noted for future consideration.

76. One detailed unstructured response received challenged the approach and methodology of the criteria used to generate the tiering system. In response to the areas of challenge, the County Council has clarified the approach underneath each aspect questioned.

a. Whether the landfill diversion elements of the wider criteria set have been double counted.

77. In criteria 2, the tonnage received at each site was examined alongside how much of that is sent to landfill and how much is recycled, composted, reused and recovered. Additionally, and most crucially, this included an assessment of the impact of those tonnages on surrounding sites, if the site in question were to close. In criteria 6 how efficiently the sites manage or have the capacity to manage the tonnage was examined. HWRCs with the lower percentage result in this category tend to be the smaller sites that do not have the scope and capacity to recycle, compost, reuse and recover as much as the larger sites. They are therefore less efficient and effective.

78. It is acknowledged that the definition of criteria 2 could have been clarified further to avoid any confusion that may have arisen, but the County Council is satisfied it was sufficient to enable members of the public to respond to the consultation effectively.

b. Why there is such a difference between waste tonnage from 2016 to 2022/23?

79. This is largely due to the introduction of the booking system during and following the pandemic. Demand has been managed since its introduction in June 2020. The pandemic itself has also resulted in a change to waste inputs and composition in general which is reflected in the data.

c. Whether 100% utilisation and capacity have been conflated in criteria 3 Site capacity and the demand for usage as recorded on the booking system.

80. It was determined that the most effective and transparent way to use this dataset, was to divide the number of available slots by the bookings made (daily average). The reason for doing this is to account solely for the utilisation of the site against its current capacity. Consequently, this rewarded sites with higher utilisation. In the case of some of the HWRCs identified in Tier 4, the average utilisation rate is much lower, and in one case less than 50%, demonstrating that these sites are therefore underused compared to many others in the network.

d. Whether there has been double counting of the number of households (including those in development) within 7 miles driving distance in criteria 1.

81. It is recognised that these areas may overlap, and this criterion has potentially apportioned the same households to two or more sites. The total number of households for all sites may therefore be higher than the total number of households in Hampshire in some cases. For example, two sites might be displaying the same household twice.
82. The querying organisation suggested applying a 14-mile range. However, this would mean that some households would fall outside of the WRAP guidance for a 'reasonable' distance to travel to a HWRC. The County Council has applied a more difficult parameter of 7 miles driving distance as per the WRAP guidance and highlighted in the data and maps provided to support the consultees. It was also claimed there is 'bunching' of sites particularly in the south of the County. This underlines the importance of criteria 4 (the distance to a suitable alternative site if the site were to close). In developing the recommendations, the County Council has ensured all would still be within the expected tonnage and household parameters of the WRAP non-statutory guidance. A key indicator remains whether a household is within 7 miles or not, for which 93% of Hampshire would still be within this criteria if proposed sites in tiers 3 and 4 were closed. The maps provided in the supporting evidence are a more effective indicator of potential impact than what the theoretical number of households might be.
83. The organisation also suggested an alternative approach to the criteria. This involved looking at the County as a whole and taking averages. It is however considered that this approach is too simplistic and does not recognise the location of the majority of the population or the spread of the existing service. The County Council has conducted extensive work on an objective rating system which assessed each HWRC against a consistent range of criteria using population and performance data, GIS mapping information, and supported by non-statutory guidance on HWRC provision. This was detailed in the supporting evidence of the Future Services consultation.
84. In respect of the proposals in the Future Services Consultation, more detailed analysis was conducted regarding those sites identified in Tier 3 and Tier 4. This analysis is included in sub-appendix B of this paper.

Recommended decision/ next steps

85. The County Council recognises the overall level of disagreement with the range of proposed options to make savings from the HWRC network. The service is clearly well used and well regarded by many residents, confirming its status as a universal service. We particularly recognise the high level of disagreement with the proposal to reduce the number of HWRCs.
86. Given that the County Council is currently unable to charge residents to access the HWRCs and that discretionary charges for services such as providing disposable items like gloves or rubble sacks would only bring minimal opportunity for income, it is clear that this option is not going to achieve, or even significantly contribute, towards the proposed savings.
87. Should the recommendations within this report be agreed then it is anticipated that these sites would fall outside of the County Council's statutory duties as a waste disposal authority leading to a budget saving. Ahead of implementing any recommendations, the County Council is open to considering alternative options and/or delivery models for any HWRCs recommended for closure, but only where any and all financial liability with regards to the operation of the site has been removed from the County Council. As identified above a number of expressions of interest have been received and these would be considered and further explored in due course should the decision be taken to close the relevant HWRC.
88. Waste management is an increasingly complex operation with the requirement to recycle more and different waste streams. Reducing the availability of certain materials at the smaller HWRCs would only negatively impact on the Council's ability to recycle smaller waste streams that would result in increased disposal costs. Only at the larger more efficient HWRCs would the Council be able to maintain or expand on the range of waste streams that can, or must, be separated. Already there are waste streams (e.g. cement-bonded asbestos and upholstered furniture) that are not available at all HWRCs. Reducing the availability for disposing or recycling of certain waste streams at different HWRCs could lead to confusion and potentially additional journeys, and potentially considerable frustration on behalf of the resident, when waste is brought to a site that no longer accepts it. Any decision would need to consider the average tonnage received for a waste stream, and the wider financial impact of withdrawing it from some or all sites. The statutory duty to provide places where residents can dispose of their bulky household and garden waste would still to be met.
89. Reducing operating hours would, in theory, generate significant savings but on their own are not sufficient to reach the proposed minimum saving of £1.2 million. Additionally, by limiting opening hours the council is constraining access to the sites that could potentially be deemed to be below the requirement of "reasonable access". A further concern regarding reduced operating hours would be the financial viability of the sites to be managed in the current manner whereby a majority are run by sub-contractors under a franchise model. These site operators need sufficient opening hours in order

to make their business viable. Whilst a one or two hour reduction in daily operating hours is deemed to have a limited impact on the business viability, the savings generated in reduced management fees of between £300,000-£600,000 would not enable the council to achieve its proposed savings. A three hour reduction in opening hours could lead to current operators ceasing to trade and therefore necessitating the management contractor to take a different approach to operating HWRCs, which would potentially be at a significantly higher cost to the Council. It is already the case for the few sites that are run directly by our management contractor that the management fees and operating costs are more expensive for the Council than those run by franchise holders. Therefore, whilst a three hours per day reduction in opening hours would net a theoretical £900,000 pound saving, this is dependent on the franchise holders still being able to have a viable business from operating the sites.

90. As set out in the consultation a combination of different measures such as some site closures and reduced opening hours might achieve the minimum proposed saving of £1.2 million, and it is acknowledged that this option was favoured as an alternative to site closures but this would still be subject to the remaining sites being viable business within these reduced hours. Only the combination of closing proposed Tier 4 sites (£500,000 saving) and a three hour per day closure across the rest of the remaining sites (c. £750,000 saving) would achieve the minimum proposed saving level of £1.2m. This level of service with sites open between five hours (winter) and six hours (summer) each day bring a number of risks that have been set out previously. One would be the risk of challenge on the grounds of the “reasonable access” requirement. Another would be the viability of the sites as businesses. Ultimately, however, this situation does not move the HWRC Service towards the minimum service level as set out in the WRAP guidance, which given the Council’s financial position is now considered necessary to implement.
91. The proposal to close all sites identified in tiers 3 and 4 as set out in the Future Services consultation is the only proposal that gets close to this minimum service level whilst leaving a viable network of HWRCs for residents to dispose of their household waste free of charge. This would generate an approximate potential saving of up to £1.6 million and would ensure the sites that remain open can do so on at least the same hours as now in order to meet the increased demand. It is, therefore, recommended to Cabinet to close all sites in the proposed Tiers 3 and 4.
92. It is recommended that closures are implemented on a phased basis to allow time to explore the alternative delivery option expressions of interest received, including consideration for impacted site where we have existing cross county boundary arrangements in place, to ensure that the sites remaining open are practicably ready to accept the greater volume of visitors and waste and to ensure that a sufficient programme of communication is in place to inform residents of the changes. It is anticipated that the first closures could occur from Summer 2025 allowing for discussions with the incumbent HWRC

management contractor, and all necessary preparations and communications to be progressed.

Equality Impact Assessment

93. As previously noted in paragraphs 32 to 38 of the draft report to Cabinet, a key part of the SP25 Programme is ensuring that the County Council understands the impact of the SP25 savings proposals on people with protected characteristics and has due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
94. Whilst councils are not mandated to conduct Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs), in keeping with good practice to record the steps taken in seeking to meet the County Councils' Public Sector Equality Duty, Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) previously completed in relation to the proposals set out within this Appendix have been reviewed and updated. These reflect the feedback received through the Future Services consultation and incorporate any additional impacts identified, so that these can be considered as part of the final decision taken by the Cabinet. The EIA is provided as an Annex.
95. By the very nature of the services that the County Council provides, there are inevitably changes that impact those people with protected characteristics. Whilst this does not mean that a proposal cannot be implemented, it does mean that the County Council needs to have an understanding, both individually and collectively, of the impact on those groups of people and look at ways of mitigating that impact.
96. The following paragraphs draw out any key points to note in terms of impacts identified in relation to these proposals for residents, service users, or staff, and any mitigations identified.
97. The EIA identified a low negative impact on two protected characteristics, age and disability. In addition, impacts were noted on poverty and rurality, even though these are not protected characteristics for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010. In all four cases, the impact related to a reduced network of HWRCs leading to increased journey lengths for some. This corresponds with the same potential impacts identified by consultees. However, although it is recognised there would be some impact on those characteristics, the assessment considered this could be minimal. The options proposed 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.

98. 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.
99. The impact on all other protected characteristics than those mentioned above is considered to be neutral.

Climate Change Impact Assessment

100. As noted in paragraph 39 of the draft Cabinet report, consideration is given to potential climate change impacts of decisions through the two decision-making tools which assess the carbon emissions and resilience impacts of a decision.
101. At this stage it is difficult to assess any specific climate change impacts relating to these proposals. However, as the implementation of these proposals progresses, we will continue to assess the potential impacts to ensure that consideration is given to how these will contribute towards the County Councils climate change targets. It is recognised that closure of some sites would lead to longer journeys for some users, however the introduction of the booking system since 2020 has already had a positive impact in that respect by encouraging residents to make best use of their visit and spreading demand across the day/week. It is however important to note that recycling and reuse activity produces fewer carbon emissions than waste disposal, so maximising recycling and reuse has clear carbon benefits. The overall aim of the HWRC service is to minimise landfill where possible and therefore reuse, recycling and recovery actions will always be prioritised in line with the waste hierarchy. This will not change irrespective of any recommended changes to the service.

Scrutiny Committee feedback

102. The recommendations set out in this appendix will be scrutinised by the Universal Services Select Committee, in advance of a decision by Cabinet.
103. To support the decision, written feedback will be separately provided by the Chairman of the Select Committee to the Cabinet, outlining any feedback and potential recommendations from the Select Committee, for consideration by Cabinet.

Rationale for the recommendations being made

104. As noted in the draft report to Cabinet, in response to a predicted two-year budget gap to 2025/26 of £132m, Directorates were asked last year to consider what savings could be made if they started to move towards a legal

minimum service level. In October and November 2023, following a stage 1 consultation process on our options for balancing the budget, Cabinet and County Council respectively approved savings proposals totalling £90.4m. Since that time, following continued growth and high inflation across adults' and children's social care, special educational needs and school transport, the predicted budget gap for 2025/26 has increased to at least £175m, underlining the need for the County Council to secure recurring savings to help towards balancing the budget on a sustainable basis.

105. Through the Equality Impact Assessment process, it was identified that some of the proposals directly impacted on 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.
106. The final recommendations made to Cabinet have been informed by the feedback received as part of the consultation, alongside other relevant factors. These recommendations will achieve total savings of £16.3million, which is a reduction from the £17.5million originally identified, albeit there is some further work to be undertaken on some proposals. The proposals set out within this appendix originally accounted for a minimum of £1.2m of this total, however following consultation and further analysis, including of the legal minimum service level, the savings proposal has been revised to £1.6m. This budget saving is achievable through the options proposed while still meeting statutory obligations and providing an HWRC service within the non-statutory guidelines.
107. Until a sustainable long-term national funding solution can be found to address the intense financial pressures facing not only the County Council, but also wider local government, the Council has no choice but to make a decision to adapt and reduce services in some areas. This means moving towards Legal Minimum Service Level.
108. The County Council acknowledges the overall level of disagreement with the range of proposed options to make savings from the HWRC network. The service is clearly well used and well regarded by many residents, confirming its status as a universal service. In particular, the high level of disagreement with the proposal to reduce the number of HWRCs is clear from the consultation responses, however in order to achieve the level of savings and efficiencies proposed in line with not only the Savings Programme to 2025 but to move towards a Legal Minimum service delivery, the most appropriate recommendation that can be presented to Cabinet while still meeting non-statutory guidelines on HWRC provision is to implement a programme of closure for those sites categorised in Tier 3 and Tier 4. While there is no statutory legal requirement that determines HWRC service provision except to make them reasonably accessible at reasonable times, it is important to recognise that this recommendation still places the County's HWRC network within all non-statutory guidelines for meeting resident demand in terms of site capacity and proximity.

109. The County Council recognises the high level of change in the waste industry currently and the challenges that all authorities face in meeting the requirements of the Environment Act from 2026, but the unprecedented budget gap that the County Council must address from 2025/26 means it has no choice but to progress with these recommendations at pace to meet the shortfall. The outcomes of the proposed Simpler Recycling initiative are expected to have positive benefits in terms of reduced non-recyclable waste arisings, although it should be noted that this does not directly affect HWRCs.
110. On balance, it should be stressed that implementing closure of Tier 3 and Tier 4 sites is the only proposal that would achieve the proposed level of savings and move the County Council towards a legal minimum service level. This would generate an approximate saving of up to £1.6 million. Reducing opening hours or implementing operational service/management changes would need to be applied countywide to all sites and would still not meet the proposed level of saving without significant reductions which may not meet the legislative requirement to make HWRCs reasonably accessible at reasonable times. Options 1-3 offer potential to support these savings in the future and further move the service towards a legal minimum level, however in isolation, or in some cases a combination thereof, they would not deliver the quantum proposed. A phased or staggered implementation from 2025 would ensure the service can adapt to ensure the impact of the changes are minimised and communicated effectively.

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>	<u>Date</u>
Savings Programme to 2025 – Revenue Savings Proposals Executive Member for Universal Services	<u>18 September 2023</u>
Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives	
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

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.)

Document

Location

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:

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out to determine the impacts of these recommendations on both residents / users of the service, and staff that would be affected should they be approved.

The EIA identified a low negative impact on two protected characteristics, age and disability. In addition, impacts were noted on poverty and rurality, even though these are not protected characteristics for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010. In all four cases, the impact related to a reduced network of HWRCs leading to increased journey lengths for some. This corresponds with the same potential impacts identified by consultees. However, although it is recognised there would be some impact on those characteristics, 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.

The impact on all other protected characteristics than those mentioned above is considered to be neutral.

Sub-appendix A
Future Services Consultation 2024
Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) Proposal Insight Summary

Background

From 8 January to 31 March 2024, Hampshire County Council invited residents, partners, and stakeholders to provide their views on options to change and reduce some local services to help the Authority address a £132 million budget shortfall faced by April 2025.

One of the options proposed was to reduce funding to Household Waste and Recycling Services (often referred to as HWRCs), by:

- introducing charging for discretionary services at HWRC sites,
- implementing alternative delivery models of HWRC services,
- changing the types of waste accepted at HWRCs,
- reducing the opening days and/or hours of HWRCs, and
- reducing the number of existing HWRC sites

Key messages

- The HWRC proposal which saw the highest level of agreement amongst respondents was to reduce the opening days and/or hours of HWRCs, with 44% agreement and 41% disagreement amongst respondents who shared a view on the proposal.
- This followed a common theme of many respondents preferring the idea of a reduced HWRC service operating from as many sites as possible over a smaller network of HWRC sites maintaining the service they currently provide.
- Users of proposed Tier 3 and Tier 4 HWRC sites were particularly opposed to the closures of sites, but were somewhat more in favour of changing the types of waste accepted at HWRCs, and changing their opening days and hours, compared with users of proposed Tier 1 and Tier 2 sites, suggesting that users of sites proposed for closure are more agreeable to changes that could keep those sites open compared with users of sites not proposed for closure.
- All other proposed changes saw higher levels of disagreement than agreement, with the highest level of disagreement for the proposed reduction of the number of HWRC sites (8% agreement compared with 87% disagreement).
- Across the proposed changes, younger people and those on higher incomes were generally more likely to express agreement than older people or those from less affluent households.
- The main impact anticipated from the proposed changes related to fly tipping, both from the perspective of the environmental impact it has on communities, as well as the financial burden could place on councils and

land owners. Across all five proposed changes, there were comments from respondents that each could result in increased levels of fly tipping.

- There was also frequent mention of views that costs would increase if changes were made to HWRC services, both dealing with waste disposed of illegally and additional demand upon the remaining HWRC network.
- Most users of proposed Tier 3 or Tier 4 sites would use another site if their current one were to close. However, 79% of respondents who use Somerley HWRC, and 47% of respondents who use Marchwood HWRC, indicated that they would either not visit another HWRC site or did not know which they would visit instead.

Who responded to the proposal?

- 10,533 respondents gave their views on the proposed changes to the HWRC service using the Response Form (75% of all 13,988 responses via the Response Form), the highest number of responses of any of the service proposals covered by the Future Services Consultation, demonstrating the high level of interest around proposed changes to HWRCs.
 - 7,012 responses were from users of proposed Tier 3 or Tier 4 HWRCs, while 2,762 responses were from users of proposed Tier 1 and Tier 2 HWRC sites, suggesting there has been particular interest in this consultation from users of sites proposed for closure.
 - 72 organisations and 54 democratically Elected Representatives provided responses to this set of proposals using the Response Form.
- Respondents were invited to add further comments to support their views on this proposal via an open-ended question. This allowed respondents to expand on impacts they felt the proposed changes would cause and suggest alternative courses of action. 4,885 respondents left an open text comment in relation to the proposal. 1,151 respondents also commented on the HWRC proposal in the any further comments open text box at the end of the consultation, designed to capture any further feedback to any of the proposals in the consultation.
- In addition, 216 'unstructured' responses (submissions which did not use the Response Form, such as letters or emails) were received that specifically mentioned the proposed changes to HWRCs. These responses are reflected in the findings below. Of these responses:
 - 168 were submitted by members of the public
 - 32 were submitted by organisations (including businesses and public bodies)
 - 16 were submitted by, or on behalf of, elected representatives (MPs or councillors)
- In order to help capture the views of young people about the consultation, members of the Hampshire County Council Youth Forum (aged between 11 and 18) were invited to consider the proposals and attend a discussion

group to share their feedback. The feedback from this group is reflected in the summary below.

Please note as this was an open consultation the respondents were self-selecting so do not provide a representative sample of the total Hampshire population.

Levels of agreement with this proposal

The table below summarises the overall levels of agreement and disagreement with each of the proposed changes to HWRC services:

	All responses						Summarised, excluding 'Don't know'	
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Disagree overall	Agree overall
Introducing charging for discretionary services (base: 10,207)	29%	21%	15%	28%	6%	1%	50%	35%
Implementing alternative delivery models (base: 9,968)	23%	20%	31%	17%	3%	6%	46%	21%
Changing the types of waste accepted at HWRCs (base: 10,090)	36%	34%	15%	11%	3%	2%	71%	14%
Reducing the opening days and/or hours of HWRCs (base: 10,274)	23%	18%	14%	34%	11%	<1%	41%	44%
Reducing the number of existing sites (base: 10,316)	69%	19%	4%	6%	2%	<1%	87%	8%

As can be seen, four of the five proposals saw higher levels of disagreement than agreement. Only the proposal to reduce opening days and/or hours of HWRCs saw marginally higher levels of agreement (44%) than disagreement (41%).

More detail on the views of respondents on each of these proposed changes is set out below, with levels of agreement and disagreement calculated excluding those who responded 'don't know'.

Introducing charging for discretionary services

Summary of views

- 35% agreed, and 50% disagreed, with this proposal (15% neither agreed nor disagreed).
 - There was higher agreement amongst elected representatives (60%), respondents from households with incomes over £60,000 (43%), and respondents from rural areas (38%).
 - There was higher disagreement amongst respondents from ethnic minority groups (57%), residents of Fareham or Rushmoor (57%) and users of proposed Tier 1 HWRCs (54%).
 - Respondents from higher income households appeared to support this proposal more than respondents from lower income households, with 43% agreement from households earning over £60,000 per year compared with 33% amongst households earning up to £20,000 per year.
- When asked about the types of services people would pay for, 56% of respondents would not pay for any of the services listed; 26% would consider paying for a convenient visiting slot, 25% would consider paying for assistance at the HWRC site, and 15% would consider paying for disposable items to make it easier to handle waste.
 - Charging for convenient time slots was more agreeable to residents of Hart, Havant, the New Forest and Test Valley (29%) compared with the average (26%), with lowest agreement amongst those living in Rushmoor (22%) and Gosport (21%).
 - Levels of agreement with the other proposed chargeable services saw similar geographical splits as mentioned above, but with smaller spreads between areas with higher and lower levels of agreement.
- There was some suggestion in the open text comments that the Council should lobby central government for the ability to charge for HWRC services:
 - *“Closing HWRCs is knee jerk reaction to government removing charges for certain types of waste. The government needs to be made aware that these sites must not be closed and allow some charges to be implemented.”*

- *“The sooner legislation is passed enabling councils to charge for HWRCs the better. I suspect that most people would be willing to pay for the convenience of using a HWRC.”*
- In contrast, there were also comments mentioning that additional charges may be unaffordable to HWRC users, potentially resulting in more fly tipping:
 - *“Many cannot afford to pay to get rid of waste.”*
 - *“Closing HWRCs or charging for their use in poorer or less affluent areas will increase fly tipping and negatively impact costs to councils to that up clear up, and worse cause environmental issues”*
- **Comments mentioning disagreement** with proposed charges also referenced impacts on older people or those with disabilities (who might benefit more from help to dispose of waste), environmental impacts of selling disposable items, and that charges would place an additional barrier to using services alongside the need to book to use them:
 - *“Charging for human help discriminates against the elderly and disabled.”*
 - *“Really don't like the idea of 'disposable' items for sale. Presumably this would involve single use (plastic?) Items then requiring going to landfill.”*
 - *“These sites are hard enough to access now we have to book a slot. Stop looking at charging to use them.”*
- **Comments mentioning agreement** with proposed charges described views that these charges be preferable to other changes to the HWRC service, that discretionary charges may not reduce service levels, and that they may make the service more accessible for customers with busy schedules:
 - *“Charging for specialist items...would be much more preferable to closing the sites entirely.”*
 - *“...charging for premium slots or help on hand should have minimal impact on the amount of recycling that can happen.”*
 - *“...charging for premium slots will benefit people who have busy lives or unusual working hours which preclude them from using the service regularly but are prepared to go later or earlier than standard opening times.”*

Implementing alternative delivery models

Summary of views

- 21% agreed, and 46% disagreed, with this proposal (31% neither agreed nor disagreed).
 - There was higher agreement amongst users of Portsmouth and Southampton HWRCs (35%), residents of Basingstoke and Deane (33%) or Winchester (27%), respondents aged under 45 (33% for

those aged under 25, 27% for those aged 25 to 44), respondents with children or young people in their household (25%), respondents from households with incomes over £60,000 (29%), and respondents from urban areas (23%).

- There was higher disagreement amongst users of proposed Tier 3 (49%) and Tier 4 (48%) sites, as well as residents of Rushmoor (53%), Havant (49%), and East Hampshire (48%).
- Agreement was higher amongst respondents from households earning over £60,000 (29%) compared with respondents earning up to £20,000 per year (22%), and was higher amongst respondents aged under 25 (33%) and 25 to 44 (27%) compared with respondents aged 45 to 54 (21%) and aged 65 or over (20%).

Reasons given for agreement or disagreement

- Individual responses from local authorities who gave a view on this proposal (including New Forest District Council, Eastleigh Borough Council, Havant Borough Council, and the Basingstoke and Deane and Hart Joint Waste Team) suggested that they do not expect this proposal to be viable for their organisations to adopt.
- Comments in relation to alternative delivery models indicated that there is general concern amongst respondents about any potential changes to the ways that HWRC services are delivered:
 - *“It is crazy to make any changes to this valuable service that has a massive impact on our local environment and sustainability/recycling”*
 - *“In essence, Hampshire CC should not be contemplating any alteration to the existing operation of its HWRCs. It is a basic service which needs to be retained at the current level.”*
 - *“At the moment it works well because it is simple - all sites accept (nearly) all the types of waste and are operated in the same way, overseen by HCC. Outsourcing their management and would give differences in how to use them and types of waste which I believe would radically reduce uptake”*
- In addition, some respondents mentioned views that alternate delivery models would be less efficient than Council-managed operations overall, or that they would not be seen as viable by potential operators:
 - *“I think HWRCs should continue to be managed by HCC. The complexities of other management systems might save money on paper, but would add additional administrative, etc burden to HCC inc finding an alternate provider, management of them, etc.”*
 - *“Without the economies of scale that can be achieved by a large county-wide network of HWRCs the organisation managing a single HWRC is likely to struggle to run the facility sustainably in the medium to long term, putting the facility at risk of closure.”*
 - *“Somerset and Suffolk Councils have previously investigated alternative delivery models, although largely unsuccessfully”*

- There were also concerns about the possibility of alternate delivery models resulting in additional costs for service users:
 - *“Stop 'smoke and mirror' proposals ie giving sites to charity or contractor to manage so that fees can be increased.”*
 - *“...the organisation may have to find ways to raise revenue to support running costs by considering service changes such as charging: this would further erode the service that residents should expect”*
- **Where respondents mentioned agreement** with the proposed change in delivery model, this was frequently seen as preferable to the closures of sites, with some expressing caution about the potential impact this could have on services:
 - *“I think closing recycling centres and reducing hours to a degree is a mistake...I agree that a good alternative could be a charitable organisation runs it but I would still want the same level of service previously offered”*
 - *“I saw mention of having some sites be handed over partially/completely to private firms, this is a great idea for the closed centres”*
 - *“If the council can't run the tip than sell it to private company that can do a better job.”*
- There was also some agreement with alternative operators making proposed Tier 3 or Tier 4 sites sustainable through the application of charging, particularly if these charges made them more attractive than travelling to an alternate HWRC:
 - *“As you are not permitted to charge for waste disposal, if Marchwood is closed it should be sold to a company that is legislated to maintain the facilities but is able to charge for waste disposal, this money would otherwise be spent on traveling to Southampton”*
 - *“Better to keep all open, transfer to private / 3rd party operators and ask resident to pay a small charge on a Pay as you Go basis.”*
- Some respondents suggested that district, town, or parish councils would be suitable operators for sites that could otherwise be closed:
 - *“Alresford Tip could be run by the town council to save money, in addition to a nominal charge per visit. With an expanding population of 300 new houses coming to Alresford we do not want to lose our facility.”*
 - *“Maybe local councils should take on these sites for their residents. Residents could pay for a years permit like trade vehicles do.”*

Changing the types of waste accepted at HWRCs

Summary of views

- 14% agreed, and 71% disagreed, with this proposal (15% neither agreed nor disagreed).
 - There was higher agreement amongst elected representatives (26%), organisations (20%), respondents aged under 45 (20% for those aged under 25, 18% for those aged 25 to 44), respondents with children or young people in their household (17%), respondents from households with incomes over £60,000 (18%), residents of Havant (19%), and users of proposed Tier 4 sites (17%).
 - There was higher disagreement amongst users of Tier 2 HWRCs (74%), as well as residents of East Hampshire, Fareham, Gosport, and Rushmoor (74% each).
 - Agreement was higher amongst respondents aged under 25 (20%) and 25 to 44 (18%) compared with respondents aged 45 to 54 (15%) and aged 65 or over (13%), although the proportion who disagreed was similar across all of these age groups.

Reasons given for agreement or disagreement

- **Those who disagreed** with the proposal to change the types of waste accepted at HWRCs commonly mentioned potential impacts on fly tipping:
 - *“Not being able to take garden waste to the HWRCs will also lead to [fly tipping] with the dumping of this waste on the roadside or up country lanes.”*
 - *“We should be increasing the type of recycling the centres take not reducing services. I can’t believe how little is currently recyclable. In addition I do think this will lead people to dump their waste”*
- Disagreement with the proposed change to the types of waste accepted also made reference to potential impacts on the environment with regards to reduced recycling rates:
 - *“We have mountains of bottles including at recycling...If your restrict other recycling items we will see even more mountains of [waste]”*
 - *“It’s important to encourage as much accessibility to recycling as much as possible. Our county is hopeless as to what we can currently recycle - more is needed not less”*
- **Those who mentioned agreement** with the proposed change in waste types accepted at HWRCs frequently described sympathy with the Council’s financial situation:
 - *“The sheer scale of the savings you need to make (notwithstanding the fact that there is no information given about other areas in which savings could - possibly more justifiably - be made) means you should do all of these things to the fullest extent”*
- There was also mention of potentially realising economies of scale in agreement with the proposed change in the types of waste accepted:
 - *“It’s sensible for certain sites to focus on certain types of waste thus gaining economies of scale. If there could be, say, one site for furniture that would be great”*

- Some respondents also mentioned that restricting types of waste accepted would be acceptable if it minimised site closures:
 - *“I use Somerley often...A reduction in the service would be acceptable in terms of opening times and types of waste but closure would equal madness and certainly result in any money saved being spent elsewhere on rectifying the consequences of closure”*
 - *“By all means consider reducing hours or days or types of waste collected. But please, on no account, close the Hayling Island tip with all the loss of quality of life, leisure time, that it would involve.”*

Reducing the opening days and/or hours of HWRCs

Summary of views

- 44% agreed, and 41% disagreed, with this proposal (14% neither agreed nor disagreed).
 - There was higher agreement amongst residents of Havant (71%, with 30% describing strong agreement) and Test Valley (48%), respondents with children or young people in their household (47%), users of proposed Tier 4 HWRCs (56%) those with household incomes of over £60,000 (52%), and those living in urban areas (48%).
 - There was higher disagreement amongst residents of Rushmoor (52%), Fareham (49%), Hart (48%) and East Hampshire (46%), as well as users of proposed Tier 2 sites (51%) and Portsmouth and Southampton HWRCs (50%).
 - Agreement was higher amongst respondents from households earning over £60,000 (52%) compared with respondents earning up to £20,000 per year (43%).

Reasons given for agreement or disagreement

- **Where respondents disagreed** with the proposal to change opening hours or days of HWRC sites, there were frequent references to risks of increased fly tipping:
 - *“Staying open 7 days a week will help discourage illegal dumping of rubbish”*
 - *“Reducing sites, charging and reducing opening hours will have a big impact on fly tipping. No reduction in hours”*
 - *“As a farming business we suffer regular episodes of fly tipping across the farm and report such incidents on at least a weekly basis and often far more frequently. Any action by HCC to reduce access to recycling facilities, or access for some types of waste, will inevitably increase the levels of fly tipping in rural areas”*
- There were also suggestions that, if opening days or hours are reduced, needs of working people should be considered when designing the schedule:

- *“Evening and weekends should remain available as the weekday daytime slots are not suitable for the majority of people working”*
- *“A lot of people work so it makes sense to open afternoon and early evening in the summer and full days at weekend.”*
- The **main driver for agreement** with this proposal appeared to be seeing it as a more agreeable option to closing HWRC sites:
 - *“Think that shutting sites would have a climate impact on people then travelling around the County to their next nearest site. Reducing hours of operation seems like a more sensible decision.”*
 - *“Please charge us more in council tax to keep the dump open, maybe reduce opening times and hours but we can not lose this facility.”*
 - *Put some sites to 4 days per week, with neighbouring sites on different rotas, and have it so you are open late one day but close early the next. Close as few sites as possible.*
- The preference for a reduction in hours as opposed to site closures seemed to be driven by views that the nearest alternative site would be too far away to conveniently access:
 - *“Where I live outside Fordingbridge Somerley is the nearest site. A lot further than 7 miles in either direction to other site. This will result in more fly tipping in the north of the Forest and more expense to employ the small truck that collects fly tipping. Please keep it open with reduced hours.”*
 - *“I use the Bunny Lane site. If it closed it would mean a long journey. I’d be happy if you cut some days to save money but not weekends”*
 - *“I think a reduction during winter months would be very sensible along with more limited opening times during the week in summer, but people are not likely to want to travel more than 7 miles.”*

Reducing the number of existing sites

Summary of views

- 8% agreed, and 87% disagreed, with this proposal (4% neither agreed nor disagreed), making this the proposed change with the second highest level of disagreement in the Future Services Consultation (with proposed changes to highways maintenance showing slightly more disagreement).
 - There was higher agreement amongst residents of Basingstoke and Deane (19%), Fareham (15%), Eastleigh (12%) and Winchester (12%), users of proposed Tier 1 (21%) and Tier 2 (16%) sites, users of Portsmouth or Southampton HWRCs (15%), respondents aged under 45 (13%), respondents with children or young people in their household (11%), and respondents from households earning over £60,000 (14%).
 - There was higher disagreement amongst residents of East Hampshire (94%), the New Forest (93%), and Hart (92%), as well as

users of proposed Tier 4 (95%) and Tier 3 (94%) sites, and respondents aged 65 or over (90%).

- Agreement was higher amongst respondents from households earning over £60,000 (14%) compared with respondents earning up to £20,000 per year (8%) and was higher amongst respondents aged under 45 (13%) compared with respondents aged 45 to 54 (9%) and aged 65 or over (6%).
- There was a strong level of disagreement with the proposed closure of HWRCs from the unstructured responses, with a large number of letters from individuals mentioning the value they placed on these services and from local councils (including parish, towns, and districts) describing their value to their local communities

Anticipated changes in behaviours following proposed site closures

- The table below outlines the expected HWRC visiting patterns of users of proposed Tier 3 and Tier 4 sites should their main site close:

Site	Most common alternative site	Would not visit an HWRC	Not sure
Aldershot	Farnborough (60%)	27%	10%
Alresford	Winchester (54%)	16%	11%
Bishops Waltham	Fair Oak (38%)	12%	18%
Bordon	Alton (40%)	21%	15%
Casbrook	Eastleigh (38%)	17%	25%
Fair Oak	Eastleigh (41%) Hedge End (40%)	11%	8%
Hartley Wintney	Farnborough (52%)	13%	12%
Hayling Island	Havant (71%)	20%	8%
Hedge End	Fair Oak (40%)	11%	18%
Marchwood	Southampton (44%)	24%	23%
Petersfield	Bordon (32%)	21%	19%
Somerley	Efford (9%)	42%	37%

Reasons given for agreement or disagreement

- As previously mentioned, the comments provided indicate that respondents were most agreeable with changing site opening hours and days as an alternative to closing sites, with lobbying for new charges, or introducing discretionary charges, also regularly mentioned by those who disagreed with the proposed site closures.

- Dorset County Council, who pay Hampshire to allow Dorset residents to use Hampshire HWRCs, mentioned that the closure of Somerly HWRC would impact on Dorset's level of service provision
- Similarly to other proposed changes, the impacts of this proposal were largely seen to involve fly tipping:
 - *"Closure of sites will come with increased fly tipping and costs of cleanup there."*
 - *"I strongly urge you not to close the Marchwood site, it seems to be very well used and would certainly increase fly tipping"*
 - *"Do not close any sites as there will be more fly-tipping. It is important to keep as many sites open as possible."*
- **Those who disagreed** with this proposed change also frequently mentioned impacts on rural communities:
 - *"Keep Romsey (Casbrook) site open - serves a wider area with a lot of rural communities that would be impacted by the closure."*
 - *"Closing the Tier 3 sites would leave a large proportion of the New Forest population without access to a HWRC."*
 - *"I am hugely concerned about closing of sites which serve the more rural communities such as Alresford, Fair Oak, Petersfield and Bishops Waltham. Once these sites are lost then residents will have to drive much further for a service that is a requirement of day-to-day living."*
- There were also a large number of mentions of concerns about increased pollution and car use as a result of proposed HWRC closures:
 - *"Having a local tip in Romsey will reduce my carbon footprint otherwise I will need to travel to Andover or Eastleigh or Winchester, meaning more road usage traffic and emissions."*
 - *"The drive to Alton is on smaller roads and would significantly increase carbon footprint and my journey there due to the roads is often in excess of 30 mins."*
 - *"Do not close any sites...The alternative is drivers going greater distances to sites, burning more fuel in the process and adding to climate change emissions...It also discriminates those who cannot drive longer distances from home for whatever reason."*
- Concerns about the impacts of future developments in Hampshire, and the demand that these could create for HWRCs were also raised:
 - *"Given the new housing development in the town I would strongly disagree that Alresford tip should be closed."*
 - *"We live in Fair Oak and the household waste recycling centre is always busy. We have more houses being built as we speak and more to come in Horton Heath."*
 - *"Basingstoke and Deane borough has over 80,000 households which implies that the borough requires further HWRC investment and capacity, especially for the future as the population continues to grow."*

- *“[Bordon] is still growing in population and there is a clear need for the facility. Closure would impact the existing and future residents.”*
- **Among the small proportion who agreed** with the proposed reduction of HWRCs, respondents frequently mentioned recognition of the need for the HWRC service to contribute to the savings required by the County Council, and the need to balance savings across different services:
 - *“Although I like the convenience of having Bishops Waltham site nearby, I understand the need to save money and travelling to Hedge End would not put me off taking items to the recycling centre. I also believe that other proposals to withdraw money from public transport and homelessness are more important to reject.”*
 - *“I think you will make the right decision and I fully endorse the sites you have proposed to shut to save money.”*
 - *“If Tier 4 sites are running at a loss and require huge investment, then it makes little sense to keep these open.”*
- There were also some suggestions from respondents who agreed with the proposed reduction in HWRC sites that some of the smaller locations are no longer fit for purpose, or cost effective to run:
 - *“We use the Hayling recycling centre a lot, at least once a month but often more than that, but we can see it must be very uneconomic to run, and would rather you saved money by closing it than cutting other services. We can use Havant if we need to.”*
 - *“I currently live on Hayling Island, but I do not use this site as it is poorly laid out when compared to Havant, which always seems to be very efficiently run and offers a greater level of service for recycling. I would be very much in favour of Hampshire council closing the Hayling site to save costs.”*
 - *“The location of the Bordon site makes it no longer fit for purpose. Station Road regularly has people parking illegally while they wait for their slot at the tip to open. Furthermore, they are often queues on to station road of people waiting their turn for the tip. Given it's a residential road, this is of great [sic] inconvenience to those who live there. It is no longer an appropriate position for the site and I would suggest it should be a priority to close.”*

Public views on finding a balance between proposed changes in site opening days and hours, and proposed site closures

- Respondents were asked **“If we were to reduce opening days and/or hours, which of these options would you prefer?”**, and given four options from which to choose:
 - Closing as few sites as possible, with a reduction in opening days and/or hours at the remaining sites (with an explanation that this choice alone would not deliver a minimum saving of £1.2 million and would need to be combined with other options)

- Closing some sites, along with some reduction of opening days and/or hours at the remaining sites (with an explanation that this choice alone would not deliver a minimum saving of £1.2 million and would need to be combined with other options)
- Closing more HWRC sites, with no reduction in opening days or hours for the remaining sites
- Not sure
- When **balancing this proposed closure of HWRC sites alongside changing HWRC opening hours**, 79% believed that the saving should be delivered through changing opening hours as much as possible, with 10% preferring a mix of the two options and 3% preferring that site closures be prioritised (8% unsure).
 - The preference for changing opening hours over site closures was highest amongst users of proposed Tier 4 (87%) and Tier 3 (86%) sites, elected representatives (85%), respondents living in rural areas (83%), and residents of East Hampshire (85%), the New Forest (84%), Havant (83%), and Test Valley (82%).
 - The preference for a mixture of changing opening hours and reducing HWRC sites was highest amongst users of Tier 1 (19%) and Tier 2 (16%) sites, respondents aged 25 to 44 (15%), and residents of Basingstoke and Deane (18%), Gosport (16%), and Fareham (15%).
 - The preference for closing HWRC sites over changing opening hours was highest amongst elected representatives (9%), users of proposed Tier 1 (9%) and Tier 2 sites (6%) and Portsmouth and Southampton HWRCs (10%), as well as residents of Basingstoke and Deane and Fareham (8%).
- Respondents were also asked “**If we were to reduce opening days and/or hours, which of these options would you prefer?**”, and given three options from which to choose:
 - Reducing opening hours at all sites, but with HWRCs still open every day (with an explanation that this choice alone would not deliver a minimum saving of £1.2 million and would need to be combined with other options)
 - Closing HWRCs on certain days of the week, but with no change to their opening hours on the other days
 - Not sure
- When **balancing these options around reducing opening hours and opening days** at HWRC sites, a majority (53%) preferred closing on particular days but maintaining opening hours, compared with 38% who preferred reducing opening hours instead of closing sites on specific days (9% not sure).
 - This preference was consistent across different groups, with the exception of organisations which provided a response, where there

was a small preference for reducing opening hours (38%) instead of opening days (35%), with 27% unsure.

Categorising HWRCs into four tiers

Overall views on proposed tier criteria

- Of those with a view on the **criteria used to propose tiers for HWRCs**, 63% felt the existing criteria were the correct ones to use and 37% felt that they were not.
 - There was higher agreement with the proposed criteria amongst residents of Basingstoke and Deane and of Gosport (both 78%), users of proposed Tier 1 (81%) and Tier 2 (73%) HWRCs, those aged under 25 (83%) and those with household incomes of over £60,000 (74%).
 - There was higher disagreement with the proposed criteria amongst residents of Hart and Havant (44%) and the New Forest (41%), as well as users of proposed Tier 4 sites (53%), elected representatives (43%), and respondents from ethnic minority groups (44%).
 - Agreement was higher amongst respondents from households earning over £60,000 (74%) compared with respondents earning up to £20,000 per year (62%), and was higher amongst respondents aged under 25 (83%) or aged 25 to 44 (71%), compared with the average (63%).

Suggested alternative criteria

- Where respondents said that they did not think we were using the correct criteria they were asked “What other criteria do you think we should consider?”. 3,295 comments were provided in response to this question.
- 2,258 of these responses suggested alternative criteria that could be used to categorise HWRCs, which related to the following:
 - Fly tipping (41% of suggestions), specifically in relation to the level of fly tipping in the area, the risk of this increasing, and the potential costs for dealing with the issue.
 - *“Risk of fly tipping on rural communities and farmers / land owners in particular”*
 - *“You should consider the impact on the borough councils and the communities of fly tipping”*
 - *“The volume of local fly tipping - which indicates the difficulty of legally disposing of waste”*
 - The suitability of alternative sites (39% of suggestions), particularly in relation to accessibility of sites for road users and for people who do not travel by car, expectations of housing developments in the area around an alternative site, and the availability of booking slots at an alternative site.
 - *“7 miles does not consider the type of roads, congestion or air quality issues”*

- *“Not all users of the tip will be car drivers and this should be given consideration”*
 - *“Our alternate site is heavily over subscribed and traffic in Havant is horrendous”*
 - The needs of site users (23% of suggestions), particularly in relation to the anticipated greater demand from rural service users, feedback from existing site users, and the needs of older site users.
 - *“The criteria are weighted against vital smaller less economical sites in more rural communities”*
 - *“User satisfaction surveys can highlight areas for enhancement and indicate how well the centres meet local needs”*
 - *“No consideration has been given to elderly or disabled residents who are unable to travel up to 7 miles”*
 - The environmental impacts of closures (16% of suggestions), such as increased car journeys to travel to alternative sites impacting air and road quality, congestion in the areas around HWRCs, and potential reductions in recycling rates.
 - *“Environmental impact of having to drive to further away HWRC”*
 - *“Site layout and capacity aren't important criteria, but the impact on surrounding busy roads is”*
 - *“Closing tips would make it less likely that people would recycle as much of their waste but would be more likely to throw more waste in their household bins. Encouraging recycling is a necessity in the current climate crisis”*
 - The distance to an alternative site (8% of suggestions), such as comments that seven miles is too far to travel (compared with 1% of comments that suggested the distance should be more than seven miles).
 - *“We are an Island. 7 miles to Havant could take a long time when the main road is busy”*
 - *“Not everyone can travel up to 7 miles, this discriminates against those who may walk in waste”*
 - *“If a site is in a rural location the seven mile rule could be expanded”*
 - 1% of suggestions mentioned the potential for income generation from discarded waste should be considered.
 - There were also some suggestions made around impacts of closures on other council-run services, issues with local flood zones, and the costs of site closures.
- 1,376 responses made mention of things that were not related to suggestions for additional criteria:
 - 37% mentioned concerns about fly tipping as a result of proposed changes

- 28% mentioned disagreement with proposals to close HWRC sites
- 11% mentioned disagreement with the proposed criteria, such as the inclusion of mention of alternative sites, the inclusion of a criteria on site layout, the inclusion of a flooding criteria, and the method of calculating the number of households
- 9% mentioned dissatisfaction with the existing booking system for HWRC site visits
- 7% mentioned general dissatisfaction with the County Council
- 5% mentioned a desire for more recycling facilities
- 4% suggested that opening days or hours at HWRCs should change instead of site closures
- 3% mentioned a desire for more investment in HWRC services
- 2% suggested the County Council partner with other local authorities to deliver efficiencies
- 2% mentioned the perceived quality of staff at HWRC sites
- 2% suggested that the County Council reduce costs by reducing the number of council staff
- 2% disagreed with the principle of tiering for HWRC sites
- 1% made comments unrelated to the consultation, such as mention of political views, or about the current level of Council Tax in Hampshire
- In addition, at the end of the Response Form on the proposed changes to HWRCs respondents were asked to provide any further comments, details of impacts, or suggestions for alternatives on how the Council could deliver savings to its budget. 31 comments suggested that different criteria should be used when making decisions, although not specifically in relation to decisions on HWRC tiers. These included comments about fly tipping, population increases and developments, impacts of changes on the capacity of remaining HWRC sites, and the environmental impacts of longer journeys being made to use HWRC sites.
- Bishops Waltham Society provided a response which highlighted some concerns about the criteria used for the proposed tiers:
 - It challenged some of the criteria proposed, specifically that there was a risk in double-reporting tonnage data under “Tonnes diverted from landfill” and “Overall recycled, composted, reused, recovered”
 - The response suggested that applying a smaller weighting for recycling (3%) than for tonnage (22%), could indicate that the importance of recycling in decision making is lower than it should be
 - Data from a previous Hampshire County Council consultation in 2016 was presented with concerns that there was no explanation for the drop in reported tonnage figures between the two years, used in the tier criteria
 - The household figures used in the consultation were challenged on the basis that they are higher than figures reported by the ONS, although the response accepts that overlaps between the radiuses

- of HWRC sites would contribute to this, particularly with households being 'clustered' in population centres
- The figures for housing developments were also challenged, on the same basis that they appear higher than their true figure when collectively compared across the radiuses of individual HWRC sites
 - The response also suggested a criteria that could be used, the number of households currently served by each site, as an alternative to the number of households within a certain radius. The response accepts would be an estimate and suggests using a calculation based on average tonnage to provide a figure for each site, which it believes would strengthen the case for maintaining some of the proposed Tier 3 or Tier 4 sites
 - Braishfield Parish Council and Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council mentioned that in their response that other factors should be given greater consideration when making decisions on proposed changes to HWRCs, although without specific reference to the decisions around tiers for HWRC sites:
 - Fly tipping rates
 - Impacts of additional car journeys if sites on congestion, road quality, pollution, and air quality
 - Impacts on communities of additional garden bonfires if sites were closed
 - Impacts on recycling rates of reduced HWRC access
 - Impacts on HWRC employees' jobs if sites were closed
 - Impacts on remaining HWRC site capacity if some sites were to close

Impacts related to protected characteristics

3,501 respondents indicated in the Response Form which characteristics or issues they felt would correspond with the impacts of the changes proposed for HWRCs. Respondents were able to select any of the protected characteristics covered by the Equality Act 2010, as well as poverty, rurality, and environmental impacts.

- 27% suggested that they did not feel that any impacts would be worsened by any of the criteria listed.
- 27% mentioned that impacts would be felt on the basis of age, with comments showing that this overwhelmingly related to older people who tend to live in rural areas and may have greater issues travelling to other sites compared with younger people.
- 20% mentioned that impacts could affect those affected by health issues or disabilities, with comments suggesting that it may be harder for people with disabilities to access an alternate site or make use of sites if their opening hours were to change.

- Only 1-2% of respondents identified each of the remaining protected characteristics, including gender reassignment, marriage and/or civil partnership, pregnancy and/or maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation, indicating that there is not a general view that any of these groups would be disproportionately impacted by the proposed changes to HWRC services.
- In addition, 59% of respondents highlighted environmental impacts, 32% noted impacts related to rurality, and 16% make reference to poverty. While these are not protected characteristics under the Equality Act, they are recognised in the impact assessments that Council services undertake.

Additional impacts identified via the further comments

The comments provided about this proposal were also analysed to understand what potential impacts the proposal could have if it were to be implemented.

3,602 out of 4,885 respondents (74%) who chose to provide comments on this proposal mentioned a potential impact in their feedback.

Of the responses which mentioned impacts:

- 83% described increases in fly tipping, with some mentions of the additional impacts of fly tipping on local land owners.
 - *“I think it important to keep these sites going as otherwise we will have even more flytipping which is unsightly, hazardous and probably more expensive”*
 - *“Making it more difficult to access a HWC will have the opposite effect & increase the scourge of fly tipping - increasing costs further”*
 - *“I feel that any closures of HWRC sites would see an increase in fly tipping. This would increase council costs of waste recovery from public spaces and also a financial penalty and inconvenience to private landowners”*
- 40% mentioned increases in other costs as a result of the proposed changes, such as through higher costs dealing with fly tipping, and increased demand for other HWRC sites.
 - *“Cutting too much cost here would increase costs to clear the increase in fly tipping that may result”*
 - *“I don't think the increased pressure on sites that stay open is considered. Farnborough already causes traffic problems at busy times. Closing HW and Aldershot would make that much worse”*
 - *“There is more and more development being built around near Somerly. Closing it will put further strain on other sites which are a big distance away”*
- 33% mentioned potential environmental impacts, such as pollution and car usage from longer drives to alternative HWRCs, reduced recycling rates, and impacts on the attractiveness of the local environment near to

remaining HWRCs from additional use, and elsewhere in the area due to fly tipping.

- *“Have you considered the environmental impact with more fuel having to be used to get to HWRCs that are far away for some areas?”*
- *“...increasing the distance people have to travel to dispose of waste increases traffic on already worn out roads and increases emissions”*
- *“On my daily walks I pick up a vast amount of rubbish... I frequently come across fly-tips of all sorts. These forms of trashing our roads and woodlands will increase greatly if you close recycling centres”*

The discussion at the Hampshire Youth Forum event highlighted three potential impacts from the proposed changes, similar to what was reported by other respondents:

- Increased travel time and car usage for people needing to travel to an alternative HWRC site.
- Increased fly-tipping, particularly in rural areas, resulting in costs to remove this and harm for local wildlife.
- Capacity issues for HWRCs that remain open if some were to close, particularly with regard to space, staffing, and ability to deal with more specialised waste.

In addition to the impacts mentioned in direct response to the proposal, at the end of the Future Services Consultation Response Form respondents were given the opportunity to provide further comments on any subjects they wished. 1,151 comments referred to the impacts of the proposed changes to HWRC services, of which:

- 48% mentioned the proposals could encourage increased fly tipping or waste burning
 - *“If the site at Marchwood closes there will be more fly tipping throughout the Waterside and New Forest area. It’s bad enough now it will get a lot worse”*
 - *“I note the comments about fly tipping being mostly by criminal groups but suspect it would be likely to increase.”*
 - *“...many residents will burn their rubbish and garden waste if this site is closed, resulting in increased local air pollution”*
- 19% mentioned potential increases in car use or congestion
 - *“It is a very hard choice, you need to save money, but in closing the Hayling tip, you will increase car usage driving to Havant more pollution and cars at busy times trying to get on and off the island”*
 - *“I cannot drive long distances to go to the HWRC, and would not want to drive for half an hour to get rid of a few lawn clippings or similar. It uses fuel, time and makes busy roads even busier”*
 - *“People will not wish to spend more hours in their car travelling to sites further away. Residents living near to the remaining open sites*

will be affected by the increase in traffic and traffic pollution on their local streets”

- 8% mentioned negative financial impacts for local authorities
 - *“Reducing access to waste sites will increase fly tipping so will be a false economy in the long run”*
 - *“...whilst you might feel you are saving by removing the tips...I think it will actually just end up causing other problems and in turn costing [more]”*
- 7% mentioned potential environmental impacts
 - *“If the Hartley Wintney site is closed the result is more time and costs for local resident users and increased pollution”*
 - *“Reducing access to HWRC's will lead to more fly tipping which is detrimental to the environment”*
- 3% mentioned increased capacity pressure on remaining HWRC sites if some were closed
- 2% mentioned impacts on rural areas
- Fewer than 1% mentioned impacts on elderly or other vulnerable service users

Suggested alternatives to the proposal

1,433 out of 4,885 respondents (29%) who chose to provide comments on this proposal made a suggestion about any alternatives to the proposal or how they felt the service could be carried out differently.

Themes around alternatives to the proposed changes are described below:

- 36% of suggested alternatives mentioned changes to the existing HWRC network, such as changing opening times and days (including the suggestion of dynamic opening hours to meet unexpected shifts in demand), introducing new HWRCs or recycling facilities (or upgrading existing services), and that the Council should look to provide waste services in partnership with other local authorities.
 - *“I feel that to close the site on weekdays (certain weekdays) would be an advantage as most people of a working age are available at weekends then to leave the weekend days alone imperative”*
 - *“Suggest closing Tier 4 centres and up grade tier 3. Hedge End is increasing in size by 3000-5000 households. It needs a new HWRC which is easier to access, more efficient and able to increase capacity.”*
 - *“I live on the border and have to pay to visit a West Berks Recycling Centre as it is too far to drive to Andover or Basingstoke and would cost me more in time and money. A mutual agreement with West Berks to use their sites would be great, as we used to be able to do.”*
- 36% suggested finding other sources of funding, including the introduction of charges for HWRC services, generating revenue from sales of items disposed at HWRCs, and increased fining for littering and fly tipping.

- *“Potentially introduce charges for less-common waste. Rubble is something already charged for, could this also apply to some other waste-types?”*
- *“Closing Petersfield would mean a minimum of 13 miles to what will become an extremely congested site. A round trip of 36 miles at least twice a month would increase cost and environmental pollution for residents. You should be able to charge a small fee to residents using a site.”*
- *“Increase fly-tipping surveillance and financial penalties and ringfence proceeds for current HWRC provision”*
- *“I have seen stuff 'put by' for dealers. I suspect that there is a resale value in these items. More needs to be done to reuse/rehome discarded items”*
- 21% suggested that changes be made to other budgets or services, such as reducing Council staffing numbers and administration, reviewing the efficiency of services, and renegotiating contracts to deliver better value for money.
 - *“The cuts need to be made in the cost of management and office staff. Not on essential services”*
 - *“Maybe it would be better to reduce local council management costs instead of reducing the people doing the work”*
 - *“Put contracts out to tender for the running of the sites. If not, directly run them and take control of all operating costs”*
- 14% mentioned implementing ways to reduce landfill rates which included encouraging greater usage of HWRCs, encouraging people to throw away less waste, and lobbying to reduce the amount of packaging used for items.
- 9% proposed improvements that could be made to waste services such as accepting more types of waste in kerbside and HWRC services, and lobbying district councils to undertake more frequent waste collections.
- 1% suggested that the proposed changes could be amended to improve them.

In addition to the alternatives mentioned in direct response to the proposal, at the end of the Future Services Consultation Response Form respondents were given the opportunity to provide further comments on any subjects they wished. 1,151 comments related to the proposed changes to HWRCs, of which:

- 14% suggested that fees or charges be introduced to HWRC services
 - *“Pay a yearly fee for using the HWRC service”*
 - *“Make a small £1 charge as suggested for every visit to a recycling centre, most people would be happy to pay for this in order to have a centre close to their home”*
 - *“I wish the government would allow charging a nominal entry fee, for which I would be happy to pay if it meant keeping the site open”*
- 7% suggested that services should be made more efficient rather than reduced

- 3% suggested that services should be expanded or receive greater investment
- 2% suggested that HWRC sites should sell items to generate revenue
- 2% suggested that staff numbers should be reduced
- 2% suggested that the Council should realise savings by running services in partnership with other local authorities
- 2% suggested that HWRC services should be reduced
- 2% suggested there should be changes to the service operating model
- 1% suggested that site closures should be based on evidence and examined individually
- 1% suggested that lessons should be learned from how other local authorities manage their HWRC services
- 1% suggested that more should be done to encourage recycling or reuse of waste
- Fewer than 1% suggested that site visits should be restricted (such as a maximum number per household per year, or by weight of waste disposed)
- Fewer than 1% suggested that volunteers should be used to deliver HWRC services
- Fewer than 1% suggested that neighbourhoods should have a skip in which they could dispose of waste
- Fewer than 1% suggested that there should be fewer disabled bays for site visitors
- Fewer than 1% suggested that the Council should look to generate sponsorship or funding from other organisations

The participants from the Hampshire Youth Forum suggested that, to discourage fly tipping, the Council could consider placing free-to-use skips around town centres and car parks, providing recycling drop-off points to provide an alternative to HWRCs, as well as ensuring that people are aware of the range of ways to dispose of waste available to them. The group also suggested that local authorities lobby to reduce the amount of packaging on items as a way of reducing waste, while also encouraging people to reuse bags and containers when shopping. Finally, the group also noted that closures should be managed collectively to ensure that areas are not left without adequate provision, and also suggested adding a small fee to booking slots at HWRCs (while recognising the impact this might have on low-income households).

One expression of interest to run HWRCs in Somerley, Pennington and Marchwood, and an expression of interest in buying the site of the Bishop's Waltham HWRC (and possibly other sites), were submitted as part of the responses, and have been forwarded to the Council's waste services for their attention.

Further comments

3,048 out of 4,885 respondents (62%) who chose to provide comments on this proposal provided other comments on the proposed changes or the HWRC service more widely.

Themes around alternatives to the proposed changes are described below:

- 39% mentioned disagreement with some or all of the proposed changes...
 - *“As residents paying council tax we deserve a decent service to get rid of our waste. The HWRCs have already faced cuts, bookings systems put in place, charges added for items, no cash sales etc which residents aren’t happy about”*
 - *“It’s appalling that you’re looking at closing sites, along with other cuts to the services that we need. These are necessary services for local residents, and should be continued”*
- ...compared with 21% who mentioned agreement with some or all of the proposed changes
 - *“The closure of less used sites in category 4 would seem sensible. The closure of less well used/efficient and less safe sites in category 3 provided there was a good access to alternative site seems possible”*
 - *“I agree with the need to reduce sites and charge for the services, it is still going to be cheaper than a skip or private option. I saw mention of having some sites be handed over partially/completely to private firms, this is a great idea for the closed centres”*
- 23% mentioned that fly tipping is an issue in their area
 - *“Fly tipping is already an eyesore in our countryside and a drain on your finances”*
 - *“We already have problems with fly tipping in the National Park”*
- 22% mentioned that the alternative HWRC site described in the consultation would be too far for them to travel to access
 - *“I am concerned that the 7 mile rule is discriminatory and does not take into account populations without transport”*
 - *“My husband and I are nearly 80 and live in Hythe. We use the Marchwood site fairly often and find it very easy to use with helpful staff. We would not be able to travel further afield and would have to pay someone to take our unwanted items away which would put a strain on our already stretched budget”*
- 16% provided positive feedback on the HWRC service...
 - *“The booking system works well so people know that they have to book in advance to attend”*
 - *“Romsey HWRC is efficient and the staff are superb”*
- ...compared with 10% who provided negative feedback, primarily relating to the booking system
 - *“The current booking system is not being optimised. On a number of occasions it has shown that there are no slots available but I have never seen the site more than 50% full”*
- 9% mentioned general disagreement with reductions to Council services

- 9% felt that future needs should be considered more when making decisions about HWRC services
- 8% felt that reducing the HWRC service was better than it being removed more widely
- 3% provided feedback on the waste services of other local authorities, such as waste collection in Hampshire's districts
- Fewer than 1% mentioned a view that people should take more responsibility for managing the waste they generate

In addition to the impacts mentioned in direct response to the proposal, at the end of the Future Services Consultation Response Form respondents were given the opportunity to provide further comments on any subjects they wished. 1,151 comments referred to the proposed changes to HWRC services, of which:

- 38% mentioned that they disagreed with some or all of the proposed changes
- 1% mentioned that they feel the current HWRC network is of a good quality
- Fewer than 1% mentioned that they disagreed with proposal related to service charges
- Fewer than 1% mentioned that any site closures would be hard to reverse once implemented

Feedback on the consultation

123 of the out of 4,885 respondents (3%) who chose to provide comments on this proposal made a comment relating to the consultation itself, on the basis of its legitimacy, the functionality of the process, or the scope and quality of the information it included. Of these:

- 31% mentioned the information provided in the consultation document, commenting on the accuracy of the information, expressing feelings that other information should have been included, or mentioning that some of the names of HWRC sites used in the consultation may not be familiar to some of the sites' users:
 - *"The document shows that only 20% of the 'waste' budget relates to running the sites, and that you're aiming to save £1.2m/ year. However I can't find either the total 'waste' budget or the budget for individual sites"*
 - *"Your assertion that there would not be an increase in fly tipping is a fallacy, just look at the evidence for the increase after charges for certain waste products were introduced a few years ago"*
 - *"The HCC proposals cannot be fully understood because (a) the actual running and overhead costs of each site have not been given, (b) the modelling process is complex and opaque and quite possibly flawed, (c) the consequences of site closure have not been explained in readily understandable terms"*
 - *"I think it is duplicitous to name the HWRC that services Romsey purely as 'Casbrook'. The majority of people will look at the list of*

potential closures and assume Romsey is not being considered. There should be a reference to the Town that it serves otherwise you will be in danger of being seen to be sneaking this through the consultation”

- 25% suggested that the Council is looking at the wrong information when deciding how to deliver savings:
 - *“...there is a lack of consideration for how reducing the number of sites will lead to an increase in fly tipping which is already a systemic issue across the country”*
 - *“You need to consider number of trips to each site, not the amount of waste each site receives, as trips to site will directly impact carbon emissions. If a HWRC were to shut, then the increased carbon output needs to be considered in your proposals”*
 - *“The proposed closures of Fair Oak and Bishops Waltham HWRCs based on current usage do not take into account projected future usage based on the number of new homes being built in the area”*
- 10% queried the legitimacy of the consultation, expressing views that proposed changes may not be consistent with the County Council’s legal duties, or that the Council should instead focusing on finding other ways to identify sources of funding:
 - *“You have already tried this once with waste charging that have been deemed unlawful. You have [a] duty to provide residents with facilities”*
 - *“...the borough council does not support the proposals for transferring responsibility to a charity, community organisation, parish council or local authority district. The legislative responsibility for HWRCs must remain with the county council”*
 - *“The effort being made by [the Council] to cease societal services should be expended on lobbying the Govt instead of asking the Tax payers to make sense of leading questions”*

Braishfield Parish Council and Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council mentioned that the following should be given greater consideration when making decisions on proposed changes to HWRCs:

- Fly tipping rates
- Impacts of additional car journeys if sites on congestion, road quality, pollution, and air quality
- Impacts on communities of additional garden bonfires if sites were closed
- Impacts on recycling rates of reduced HWRC access
- Impacts on HWRC employees’ jobs if sites were closed
- Impacts on remaining HWRC site capacity if some sites were to close

Kingsley Parish Council commented that the proposed changes may not be consistent with the Council’s stated priorities, as the proposed changes could undermine the Council’s climate change commitments around carbon neutrality, while also impacting its ability to support people to recycle their waste.

Swanmore Parish Council mentioned concerns that the older population of Hampshire has not been taken into account when developing its proposed HWRC changes, and that rural sustainability might be impacted by site closures.

Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council and Hart District Council Joint Waste Team suggested that the proposed changes could breach existing (non-statutory) Waste and Resources Action Program (WRAP) guidance around the number of households served by each HWRC, disagreeing with figures provided in the consultation document.

One local residents society (the Bishop's Waltham Society) provided a document outlining concerns about the quality of information provided in the consultation, queries about the criteria used for the proposed tiers (covered previously in this summary), and challenging the utilisation, capacity, and mileage figures provided, which has been reviewed by the Waste Service.

The New Forest National Park Authority provided a response which challenged the legal basis for making reductions to the HWRC network, on the basis of the Council's statutory responsibilities to support National Parks.

Appendix B – Site-specific feedback analysis

Proposed Tier 3 sites

Aldershot HWRC

Aldershot HWRC is a small single-level site located in the North Lane industrial area. It was built in approximately 1990, and is restricted in size by a building on-site which is partially used as a sales area. Due to its location, it attracts some usage by Surrey residents, but despite this only has an average 41% utilisation through bookings. It received 2,701 tonnes of waste in 2022/23, which places it 20th of the 24 Hampshire HWRCs, and as such it is the most expensive to run based on cost per tonne. Users are required to use steps to reach the main skips.

A total of 210 respondents to the Consultation Form selected Aldershot as their usual HWRC. This was the lowest selected usual site across the HWRC network. Key themes highlighted in free text responses by Aldershot users included concerns about having to travel to the next nearest site at Farnborough and the associated impact on capacity there. It is however just six miles to the Farnborough HWRC, which is within the WRAP non statutory guidance, while the current utilisation rate along with the proportion of users originating from Surrey, does not suggest a significant negative impact on capacity at Farnborough. Whilst 60% of Aldershot users said they would use Farnborough if Aldershot closed, 27% said they would not visit any HWRC. It is hoped residents would reconsider their reuse and disposal options. Site users could make the best use of visits to reduce trips or consider utilising alternative options such as kerbside collections for materials such as garden waste. The booking system will further assist with managing demand at peak periods.

Other Aldershot users noted the impact on those site users with disabilities and older adults. Farnborough as the next nearest site is classified as a proposed Tier 2 site which, unlike Aldershot, does not have steps. It is therefore better equipped to meet the needs of those with protected characteristics such as age and disability as it is split-level, and more accessible and fit for purpose. Land is also potentially available within the Aldershot Urban Area Expansion (AUE) for a new modern site to serve Rushmoor Borough.

The above concerns expressed by Aldershot HWRC site users have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 3 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Aldershot HWRC should remain within the

proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

Bordon HWRC

Bordon HWRC, located in Station Road on the west of the town, is a split-level site built in approximately 1985. It is bounded on one side by residential properties, and well-established trees on the others. It has a steady utilisation rate of booked slots at around 75%, and received 3,566 tonnes of household waste in 2022/23, placing it 16th of the 24 HWRCs in the county.

A total of 1,233 respondents to the Consultation Form selected Bordon as their usual HWRC, which was the highest number of any proposed Tier 3 site. Half of all free text responses focused on the significant house building in the Whitehill Bordon area, and the impact this demand would have alternative sites. Many considered that a driving distance of seven miles was too far on inadequate roads, particularly between Bordon and Alton, and that closure of both Bordon and Petersfield HWRCs would create a substantial service gap. It was noted that longer journeys could be detrimental for the environment, with Fly-Tipping in the local countryside a key concern. Less Bordon users than the average were supportive of reduced opening hours (38% vs 44%), and 96% disagreed with closures.

Driving distance between the Bordon HWRC and the nearest alternative in Alton ranges from between 6.9-7.4 miles using different online journey planning tools. Although it is recognised that Bordon HWRC is on the western side of the town so distances may be slightly longer than seven miles for some residents, the travel time would still be within the 30 minutes recommended for a predominantly rural area. While Bordon is one of a minority of split-level HWRCs to be classified as a Tier 3 site, this proximity to Alton along with Alton's larger capacity and better access, makes it more difficult to justify retention of Bordon HWRC in a legal minimum service approach. Bordon is also an older site than Alton, with less scope for expansion due to the surrounding mature trees and watercourses.

The consultation responses received in respect of Bordon HWRC have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 3 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Bordon HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

Casbrook HWRC

Casbrook HWRC, also commonly known as Romsey or Timsbury, is located on Bunny Lane in a rural setting, three miles north of the town centre. Casbrook is a single level site with steps and is in the bottom five smallest sites. The site is the oldest in the network built in 1978, but was substantially redeveloped in 2011. It received 2,833 tonnes of household waste in 2022/23, placing it 17th of the 24 HWRCs in the county.

816 respondents selected Casbrook as their usual HWRC. Almost 1,000 comments were received in response to the open text feedback questions, 27%* of which, provided positive feedback about the site. This is the joint highest across the whole network and alongside the volume of comments, demonstrates the value Casbrook site users place on the facility.

The most common theme of the free text comments were Fly Tipping concerns.

This was followed by respondents noting the rural nature of Casbrook and how such areas should not be disadvantaged just because less people live there. Whilst the County Council acknowledges this perception, the criteria used to objectively rate all HWRCs and place them into the tiered system, was based upon a number of other factors in addition to the number of households served and housing projections. Casbrook consistently performed in the lowest group of HWRCs across most criteria. Notably the current utilisation rate of Casbrook despite a large catchment area is just 47%. The next nearest site at Eastleigh has the capacity to cope with the diverted tonnage from Casbrook users. 38% said they would use Eastleigh if Casbrook closed, however 25% said they were unsure.

The above concerns expressed by Casbrook HWRC site users have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 3 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Casbrook HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

** respondents were permitted to select multiple feedback options (therefore do not total 100%).*

Hedge End HWRC

Hedge End HWRC is the second oldest site in the network and is a smaller than average site in a challenging location which is now landlocked within a housing estate. It is a semi split-level layout but still requires users to use steps. Hedge End has a steady utilisation rate of booked slots at around 72%,

and received 3,843 tonnes of household waste in 2022/23, placing it 14th of the 24 HWRCs in the county.

235 respondents selected Hedge End as their usual HWRC, which was the second lowest selected site. Whilst Fly Tipping was the highest topic of apprehension, Hedge End users also expressed significant concern regarding projected housing in the surrounding area. Prior to the implementation of the booking system, queuing and congestion in the adjacent road network was a significant issue for local residents. Despite 41%* of responses noting concern on the suitability of alternative sites, Netley HWRC is just 4 miles away, which is the shortest distance to the next nearest site than all of the Tier 3 and Tier 4 sites proposed for closure. Additionally, 23%* of respondents (compared to 3% of all free text comments) expressed concern that closing sites such as Hedge End would put pressure on alternative sites, however Eastleigh is also just 7 miles away and is the newest HWRC with sufficient spare capacity to manage extra demand.

The consultation responses received in respect of the Hedge End HWRC have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 3 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Hedge End HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

** respondents were permitted to select multiple feedback options (therefore do not total 100%).*

Marchwood HWRC

Marchwood HWRC is located on Normandy Way in a rural setting near marsh land and the River Test. It is the fifth largest site in the network, however has an average utilisation rate of booked slots of 59%. It is a stepped site that processed 4,901 tonnes of household waste 2022/23, placing it 11th of the 24 HWRCs in the county.

A total of 890 respondents to the Consultation Form selected Marchwood as their usual HWRC. A high number of responses to both the standard questions and free text boxes highlighted the sensitivity of the local landscape and proximity to the New Forest National Park causing a potential for environmental impacts such as pollution and congestion on local roads. In particular, Fly-Tipping was regularly referenced in free text responses (87%), which was one of the highest outputs per site. As noted elsewhere, the volume and nature of fly-tip incidents in the New Forest generally does not reflect waste from a household source, but of criminal activity looking to avoid correct disposal for largely commercial waste. Authorities elsewhere in the country

that have rationalised their HWRC networks have not experienced significant increases in Fly-Tipping as residents get used to alternative options.

A higher-than-average number of Marchwood users expressed concern that alternative HWRCs were too far away (27%* vs 22%). For those residing in Totton or Marchwood itself, there is a suitable alternative within five miles at the City Depot HWRC, operated by Southampton City Council for which a reciprocal arrangement exists for Hampshire taxpayers to access the site. Unlike Marchwood, City Depot is a modern split-level facility with no steps which makes it more accessible and easier to use. This distance is more acute for residents of the southern Waterside who already have a short journey to reach Marchwood, however a journey to either City Depot or Efford near Lymington would still be within the 30 minutes recommended drive time for a rural area.

The above concerns expressed by Marchwood HWRC site users have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 3 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Marchwood HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

** respondents were permitted to select multiple feedback options (therefore do not total 100%).*

Petersfield HWRC

Petersfield HWRC, is located on Bedford Road in an industrial estate near the A3. It is a single level stepped site and was built in approximately 1995. It is the sixth smallest site in the network and has a low utilisation rate of booked slots of 52%. Petersfield processed 2,764 tonnes of household waste in 2022/23, placing it 19th of the 24 HWRCs in the county, and has a high rate of processing cost per tonne.

988 respondents selected Petersfield as their usual HWRC. This was the second highest selected site. The proximity of the site to the South Downs National Park is likely to have influenced the large volume of concerns received about a potential rise in Fly Tipping should the site close. There was a slightly higher than average (88%* v 83%) rate of concern amongst Petersfield users, alongside noting the assumption any savings made via site closures may be offset with the costs of having to clear up any incidents of Fly Tipping. As previously explained, the volume and nature of fly-tip incidents in the Petersfield and South Downs area, generally does not reflect waste from a household source, but of criminal activity looking to avoid correct disposal for

largely commercial waste. Authorities elsewhere in the country that have rationalised their HWRC networks have not experienced significant increases in Fly-Tipping as residents get used to alternative options.

Some Petersfield users highlighted the distance to the next nearest site at Waterlooville (approximately 13 miles), however online journey planning tools still indicate the drive time is within 20 minutes, so in line with the non-statutory guidance. Moreover, in the context of moving towards a Legal Minimum Service Level, the County Council must focus provision on areas of higher urban density and those more fit for purpose modern Tier 1 and Tier 2 sites. It is hoped residents would reconsider their reuse and disposal options. Site users could make the best use of visits to reduce trips or consider utilising alternative options such as kerbside collections for materials such as garden waste.

The consultation responses received in respect of the Petersfield HWRC have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 3 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Petersfield HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

** respondents were permitted to select multiple feedback options (therefore do not total 100%).*

Somerley HWRC

Somerley HWRC is located close to the Dorset border on Verwood Road near Ringwood. It is in a rural area to the west of the New Forest National Park, three miles north-west of Ringwood town centre. The County Council currently has an arrangement in place with Dorset Council whereby Dorset residents can use the site given their proximity to the HWRC. Currently approximately 45% of users are from Dorset which contribute to the 67% utilisation rate of booked slots. 3,793 tonnes of household waste was processed in 2022/23, placing it 15th of the 24 HWRCs in the county. Somerley HWRC is also one of the oldest sites in the network built in approximately 1980.

A total of 685 respondents to the Consultation Form selected Somerley as their usual HWRC. Key themes highlighted in free text responses by Somerley users were a detrimental impact on the New Forest National Park due to a perception that fly-tipping would increase (82%) and the potential creation of a service gap in the Fordingbridge vicinity due to the proximity to alternative

sites (39%). This is reflective in the high proportion of Somerley users citing environmental impact as a concern (70%), and almost half noting impact on rurality. There was slightly higher than average support for reducing opening hours to avoid full site closures (46% vs 44%), but 96% were against closing HWRCs.

42% of respondents identifying as Somerley users stated they would not visit another HWRC if the site was closed, the highest result of any site, with only 6% indicating they would travel to Efford. As previously noted, almost half of all Somerley users come from Dorset, so this result reflects the probability that those Dorset residents would likely go to an alternative Dorset site. While it is acknowledged that in the event of Somerley closing, a small proportion of households in the north-west corner of the New Forest District would not be within seven miles of an alternative HWRC, they would still be within 30 minutes average drive-time which is the non-statutory guideline for predominantly rural areas. With regards to fly-tipping, experience of other local authorities who have reduced their network of HWRCs does not result in a significant increase in fly-tipping incidents. The volume and nature of fly-tip incidents in the New Forest do not reflect waste from a household source, but of criminal activity looking to avoid correct disposal for largely commercial waste.

The above concerns expressed by Somerley HWRC site users have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 3 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that this site should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

Proposed Tier 4 sites

Bishops Waltham HWRC

Bishops Waltham HWRC is located on Claylands Road in a semi industrial setting on the outskirts of the market town. The site was built in 1986. It has one of the County's lowest utilisation rates of booked slots of 48%, and in 2022/23 processed 2,120 tonnes of household waste which was the third lowest tonnage received across the whole HWRC network.

426 respondents selected Bishops Waltham as their usual HWRC. Concerns were expressed about having to travel to Eastleigh as the next nearest site if other nearby sites such as Fair Oak and Hedge End were also closed in addition to Bishops Waltham. Eastleigh is the newest HWRC in the network

built in 2016 and also one of the largest. Due to this along with the current cluster of four HWRCs closely located within the Borough, Eastleigh's average utilisation rate is around 50%. This means the site has significant capacity in terms of bookings and ability to accept increased waste volumes to cope with diverted tonnage from nearby sites that may be closed, particularly as utilisation rates at Bishops Waltham and Fair Oak are similarly lower than average.

When asked in the free text comments if residents thought other criteria should be considered, 46% stated that Fly Tipping issues should be included. This was higher than the average of 41%. Whilst it has been a common concern expressed across all free text responses, where other local authorities have closed sites there is no evidence to suggest this is true. Our experience in Hampshire suggests that Fly-Tipping is mainly carried out by criminal organisations looking to avoid charges for disposal, rather than householders. The County Council will continue to focus on ways to reduce fly tipping, such as through the Hampshire Fly-Tipping Strategy and Action Plan which we are delivering in partnership with a number of private and public sector organisations.

The consultation responses received in respect of the Bishops Waltham HWRC have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 4 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Bishops Waltham HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

Fair Oak HWRC

Fair Oak HWRC is located on Knowle Lane in Eastleigh Borough and is situated on a former landfill site in a rural area, although there has been significant house-building close by in recent years. It is one of the older sites in the network, being built in approximately 1985. It received 2,592 tonnes of household waste in 2022/23, meaning it has the fourth lowest tonnage throughput of all the 24 HWRCs.

A total of 245 respondents to the Consultation Form selected Fair Oak as their usual HWRC, the lowest response for a proposed Tier 4 site. This reflects the average utilisation rate for the HWRC which indicates that only 33% of bookable slots are booked up. The close proximity of safer and more modern alternative sites in Eastleigh and Winchester is likely a key reason for this, as the steps at Fair Oak HWRC make the site more challenging for elderly users.

While there was a general concern about congestion at other sites if Fair Oak closed (21% vs the average 8%), it is felt that the relatively low patronage should comfortably be accommodated elsewhere, and in any case the booking system in place helps to manage any demand. A number of respondents also highlighted the substantial house building underway and planned within Eastleigh Borough, however again these projections were factored into the modelling criteria to determine the allocation of tiers, and do not suggest any significant detrimental impact on the capacity of those remaining sites to manage this.

The above concerns expressed by Fair Oak HWRC site users have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 4 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Fair Oak HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

Hartley Wintney HWRC

Hartley Wintney HWRC is located on Springwell Lane and is in a rural setting north of the town. It has poor access at the end of a narrow country lane. It is one of the older sites in the network built in approximately 1985. It is the third smallest site in the County. In 2022/23 the site processed 2,782 tonnes of household waste, placing it 18th of the 24 HWRCs in the county.

356 respondents selected Hartley Wintney as their usual HWRC. A higher-than-average response rate for positive feedback on the HWRC network was received from Hartley Wintney users (22%* vs 16%). This was reflected in specific comments about customer service at the site. The 73% utilisation rate further confirms the value placed on the site from residents.

Similar to other rurally located sites, users expressed higher than average concerns on a potential rise in Fly Tipping should Hartley Wintney close (44%* v 41%). Many respondents noted that the next nearest site at Farnborough would be over capacity if tonnage is diverted there. Hartley Wintney is one of the oldest sites and requires significant investment to match the higher standards and accessibility of those higher tiered sites. Whilst Farnborough HWRC would inevitably have increased demand as a result of a closure of Hartley Wintney, the booking system will help to manage this. Land is also potentially available within the Aldershot Urban Area Expansion (AUE) for a new modern site to serve the north-east Hampshire conurbation.

Environmental impacts were also expressed by a slightly higher than average amount of Hartley Wintney users (35%* v 33%). Longer car journeys and associated damage to roads were specifically mentioned. The booking system has already encouraged residents to think more carefully about using the HWRCs and how often by making best use of their booking.

The consultation responses received in respect of the Hartley Wintney HWRC have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 4 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Hartley Wintney HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

** respondents were permitted to select multiple feedback options (therefore do not total 100%).*

Hayling Island HWRC

Hayling Island HWRC is situated in a unique location to the south of the mainland. It is located in a residential area and close to a caravan park. It is the smallest HWRC in the County and also one of the oldest sites built in approximately 1984. It processed the second lowest amount of tonnage in the network in 2022/23 with 1,522 tonnes of household waste. Despite the location, the sites utilisation rate of booked slots is one of the lowest at 54%.

A total of 663 respondents to the Consultation Form selected Hayling Island as their usual HWRC, the highest response for a proposed Tier 4 site and around a third of all consultees who indicated they usually visited a Tier 4 site. Concerns over a negative impact on the locality, in the event that the HWRC was closed were a strong trend, with many residents citing the Langstone Bridge as the single road on/off the island as a particular source of apprehension. The associated inconvenience of travelling to Havant and beyond, particularly during the summer months, was referenced, although it was recognised that Hayling Island residents already have to leave the island to use other amenities so this impact could be mitigated by combining HWRC visits with other errands. Alternative sites within Havant Borough such as Havant and Waterlooville are also much larger, more modern split-level sites which are generally easier to use for residents with protected characteristics. In normal traffic conditions, Havant is both within 7 miles and 20 minutes drive for residents.

There was much higher agreement among Hayling Island users to reduce opening days or hours than elsewhere (77% vs average 44%), which is perhaps reflective of the small catchment of this particular site, but 94% were opposed to full closure. Concerns over the impact of increased Fly-Tipping as a result of a potential closure were significantly lower here though with only 54% indicating it was a worry for them, however the potential cost of clearing up any fly-tips was noted as a consideration.

The above concerns expressed by Hayling Island HWRC site users have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 4 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the Hayling Island HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.

Alresford HWRC

New Alresford HWRC is located in a small industrial estate off Prospect Road and is the smallest HWRC in Hampshire. It was refurbished in 2003 but only has capacity for a limited number of waste containers so it does not currently accept waste types such as wood and DIY waste. The average booking utilisation is only 40% of all available slots, and in 2022/23 it received just 935 tonnes of waste making it the least used HWRC in Hampshire.

A total of 265 respondents to the Consultation Form selected New Alresford as their usual HWRC. Despite its size and capacity limitations, it is clear from feedback that it is a well-valued local service. 20% of free text responses highlighted a negative impact on protected characteristics with age and disability a particular concern, while 5% mentioned increased difficulty for users with limited access to transport. This is reflective of Alresford HWRC's status as one of only two in the county where controlled pedestrian access is permitted at set times. Rurality was also noted as a consideration with many properties possessing large gardens.

Other recurring themes highlighted as impacts included increased Fly-Tipping (77%) and suitability of alternative sites (43%). New Alresford is almost equidistant between Winchester and Alton, both localities which have a modern split-level HWRC which is better equipped to serve elderly customers or those with mobility issues, however there was still some concern noted that the A31 can sometimes be congested and increased journeys could impact on air pollution. Non-statutory guidelines recommend a drive time of up to 30 minutes for rural areas, and both Winchester and Alton are comfortably within that in normal traffic conditions. As noted above, New Alresford HWRC is the least-

visited site in Hampshire and rarely receives more than 50% bookings per day, so this usage can be comfortably absorbed at alternative sites.

The consultation responses received in respect of the New Alresford HWRC have been fully considered. Taking into account this feedback and weighing this up against both the analysis of the non-statutory guidance and the criteria used to determine the tier 4 sites, as well as the need to meet the budget savings required, it is considered that the New Alresford HWRC should remain within the proposals for closure being recommended within this report.