



Clerk: Jo Beer
Telephone: 01803 207063
E-mail address: scrutiny@torbay.gov.uk
Date: Monday, 16 January 2012

Overview and Scrutiny
Town Hall
Castle Circus
Torquay
TQ1 3DR

Dear Member

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD - TUESDAY, 17 JANUARY 2012, 2.00 P.M.

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the Tuesday, 17 January 2012 meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board, the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda No	Item	Page
7.	Spatial Planning and Waste	
	• Combined Impact Assessment – Waste Recycling	19 - 26
	• Combined Impact Assessment – HWRC	27 - 34
	• Combined Impact Assessment - Concessionary Fares	35 - 42
	• Scrutiny - Spatial Planning presentation (summary of the above Combined Impact Assessments)	43 - 54

Yours sincerely

Jo Beer
Clerk

This page is intentionally left blank

Budget Proposals 2012/13: Major Decision: Business Unit: Spatial Planning (Waste Recycling)

Combined Impact Assessment: Full assessment (Part 2)

The council and its partners are facing a significant challenge in the savings it needs to make over the next couple of years. This Full Impact Assessment has been developed as a tool to enable business units to fully consider the impact of proposed major decisions on the community. As a council we need to ensure that we are able to deliver the savings that we need to make from the 1st April and be able to justify our decisions through any legal challenge.

This full assessment, combined with the initial review, will evidence that you have fully considered the impact of your proposed changes and carried out appropriate consultation on those changes with the key stakeholders. The Combined Impact Assessment will allow Councillors to make informed decisions as part of the decision-making process regarding the council's budget.

Name: Mark Irving/Sally Farley
Support/Service Manager, Environment Policy & Performance

Position: Senior Service Manager - Customer Service & Planning

Business Unit: Place & Environment

Department: Spatial Planning

Date: December 2011

Please see - agenda item 7, page 14

Summary from Overall Proposal (Updated as required)

Proposals – Outline	Savings 2012/13		Implementation Cost Include brief outline + year incurred	Delivery In place 01/04/12 If earlier or later state date	Risks / impact of proposals	Type of decision*		
	Income £ 000's	Budget reduction £ 000's				Internal	Minor	Major
Waste Recycling Credits	50	-	0	Nov 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential risks Impact on community Knock on impact to other agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council now collects recyclables on the kerbside and the financial case for these credits is therefore substantially diminished. The credits stopped in November 2011. The effects on Organisations has been minimised in that only textile credits have been withdrawn and the sale price of textiles has increased considerably in recent times, meaning that the loss of the credit can be absorbed by the organisation without net loss. 		✓	

Page 0

Stage 1: Purpose of the proposal

No	Question	Details
1.	Clearly set out the purpose of the proposal	<p>That the Authority ceases payment of the recycling credit to charity and community groups that claim credits for items other than furniture, paper and garden waste.</p> <p>More specifically: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council now collects recyclables on the kerbside and the financial case for these credits is therefore substantially diminished. The credits stopped in November 2011. The effects on Organisations has been minimised in that only textile credits have been withdrawn and the sale price of textiles has increased considerably in recent times, meaning that the loss of the credit can be absorbed by the organisation without net loss.

No	Question	Details
2.	Who is intended to benefit?	Charity and community groups that claim credits e.g. The Scouts
3.	What is the intended outcome?	From the 21 November 2011 the above groups will not be able to claim a recycling credit for textiles. This will mean a possible reduction in one of their income streams but with negotiation of their current material contracts they may be able to negate any losses as the current textile markets are very buoyant.

Stage 2: Evidence, Consultation and Engagement

No	Question	Details
4.	Have you considered the available evidence?	Torbay Council currently pays recycling credits to charity and community groups. Because of budget pressures the Council needs to reduce costs, therefore by not paying out a recycling credit for textiles the council will save in the region of £40k p.a. As a result of the budget pressures facing the Council it is becoming more difficult to justify the payment of a recycling credit to external organisations now that a comprehensive collection of recyclables from the kerbside is available to every household throughout the Bay. The textiles currently collected by the charities and community groups could be collected by TOR2 from the kerbside at no additional cost to the Council or TOR2.
5.	How have you consulted on the proposal?	Affected groups have already been notified via letter – they have been given 6 weeks notice of the decision. To date we have received 5 responses, however no objections or complaints have been received.
6.	Who have you consulted with?	Charity and community groups that claim credits.
7.	How many people responded?	To date we have received 5 responses, however no objections or complaints have been received.
8.	Outline the key findings?	Enquiries regarding last date for submission of final claim – no objections
9.	What amendments may be required as a result of the consultation?	As the community groups only receive £15 per ton for paper from the recycling companies, it was thought that taking away the recycling credit of £57.76 was disproportionate and would almost remove their entire income stream, so this will be continued at least for 2011/12 financial year.
10.	How will the results be published?	Replied verbally to enquiries

Stage 3: Impact Assessment

No	Question	Details
11.	Identify the potential positive and negative impacts on specific groups	
	All groups in society generally	<p>Positive Impact Although the charity and community groups will no longer receive the recycling credit funding they will still receive income from, recycling companies and may be in a position to be able to re-negotiate how much they receive for raw materials. This proposal only concerns credits for items other than furniture, paper and garden waste.</p> <p>Negative Impact Charity and community groups that currently receive recycling credits (e.g. The Scouts) will no longer receive the funding.</p>
	Older or younger people	N/A
	People with caring responsibilities	N/A
	People with a disability	N/A
	Women or men	N/A
	People who are black or from a minority ethnic background (BME)	N/A
	People with particular religion or belief / no belief	N/A
	People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual	N/A
	People who are transgender	N/A
	People who are in a marriage or civil partnership	N/A
	Women who are pregnant / on maternity leave	N/A

No	Question	Details
12.	What are the impacts of your proposals to other agencies?	As stated above this proposal will effect charity and community groups (i.e. the Scouts) that claim credits for items other than furniture, paper and garden waste.
13.	Does your proposal link to other decisions you are making?	No
14.	Is there scope for your proposal to eliminate discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and/or foster good relations?	<p>The organisations would still receive income from the recycling companies that they sell the materials to, and might be able to renegotiate with them how much they receive for the raw materials thereby minimising the potential for impact. Furniture can still be collected, and a recycling credit paid, as Torbay Council can claim this amount back from Devon County Council. This is possible due to Torbay Council's partnership working with Devon County Council, being part of the Devon Authorities Waste Reduction and Recycling Committee.</p> <p>As the community groups only receive £15 per ton for paper from the recycling companies, it was thought that taking away the recycling credit of £57.76 was disproportionate and would almost remove their entire income stream, so this will be continued at least for 2011/12 financial year.</p>

Stage 4: Course of Action

No	Action	Details
15.	State a course of action	Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers – As the community groups only receive £15 per ton for paper from the recycling companies, it was thought that taking away the recycling credit of £57.76 was disproportionate and would almost remove their entire income stream, so this will be continued at least for 2011/12 financial year.
16.	Identify any plans to alleviate any negative impacts	See above (15)

Stage 5: Monitoring

No	Action	Details
17.	Outline plans to monitor the actual impact of proposals	<p>The full impact of decisions will only be known once it is introduced. We will monitor the impact via the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Customer complaints ▪ Feedback from the charities/community groups affected by the proposals ▪ Monitor budget savings achieve

Notes:

- *The Equality Duty needs to be an integral part of the decision making process. Decision makers must consider what information he/she has and what further information may be needed in order to give proper consideration to the Equality Duty.*
- *Commissioned services – No delegation. Public bodies are responsible for ensuring that any third parties which exercise functions on their behalf are capable of complying with the Equality Duty, are required to comply with it and that they do so in practice.*

Action plan / mitigating actions

Please detail below any actions / mitigating actions you need to take: -

No.	Action	Reason for action / mitigating action	Responsibility	Deadline date
1	Letters issued to community groups/charities advising them that the recycling credits funding will cease – 6 weeks notice will be given	To give community groups/charities 6 weeks notice of the decision	Ian Hartley	September 2011 – Complete
2	Regular budget monitoring	To verify budget reduction achieved	Ian Hartley	Half Yearly starting April 2012 and September 2012.
3				
4				
5				
6				

This page is intentionally left blank

Budget Proposals 2012/13: Major Decision: Business Unit: Spatial Planning

Combined Impact Assessment: Full assessment (Part 2)

The council and its partners are facing a significant challenge in the savings it needs to make over the next couple of years. This Full Impact Assessment has been developed as a tool to enable business units to fully consider the impact of proposed major decisions on the community. As a council we need to ensure that we are able to deliver the savings that we need to make from the 1st April and be able to justify our decisions through any legal challenge.

This full assessment, combined with the initial review, will evidence that you have fully considered the impact of your proposed changes and carried out appropriate consultation on those changes with the key stakeholders. The Combined Impact Assessment will allow Councillors to make informed decisions as part of the decision-making process regarding the council's budget.

Name: Mark Irving/Ian Hartley

**Position: Senior Service Manager - Customer Service & Planning
Waste Client Manager**

Business Unit: Place & Environment

Department: Spatial Planning

Date: January 2012

Please see - Agenda Item 7, page 15

Summary from Overall Proposal (Updated as required)

Proposals – Outline	Savings 2012/13		Implementation Cost Include brief outline + year incurred	Delivery In place 01/04/12 If earlier or later state date	Risks / impact of proposals	Type of decision*		
	Income £ 000's	Budget reduction £ 000's				Internal	Minor	Major
Charging for Waste Rubble or Similar Material	50		£15,000 - £18,000 Gross takings on current throughput £100k but TOR2 handling charge cf£50k. May also be a fly-tipping control cost especially in short term	Report to Council Sept 2011. Will need time to implement	Customer resistance in short term. Fly-tipping may increase. Negotiations in progress with TOR2 re: costs of administering the system on site. Could affect the bottom line – current estimate £100k split 50/50. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased fly tipping Complaints from members of the public as to why they now have to pay for something previously free of charge (misconception that this type of waste is household waste) Non achievement of income 	✓	✓	

Stage 1: Purpose of the proposal

No	Question	Details
1.	Clearly set out the purpose of the proposal	Charging for Waste Rubble or Similar Material – That Torbay Council implements a charging system for waste material associated with rubble and for vehicle tyres at the Paignton Household Waste Recycling Centre
2.	Who is intended to benefit/will this affect?	All householders taking this type of waste to the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC).
3.	What is the intended outcome?	Charging for Waste Rubble or Similar Material: - Charges are inclusive of VAT. 1. Soil, rubble, ceramics, paving slabs, bricks, building blocks etc - £2 per bag * 2. Asbestos (a 6' x 3' sheet) or a bag * - £20

No	Question	Details
		<p>3. Plasterboard (a 8' x 3' sheet) or a bag * - £7 4. Car Tyres - £2 each (no commercial)</p> <p>* A bag should be no bigger than 20" x 30"</p>

Stage 2: Evidence, Consultation and Engagement

No	Question	Details
4.	Have you considered the available evidence?	<p>Torbay Council like all other councils in the UK only has a legal obligation to provide Recycling Centre facilities for household waste (which is waste arising from the day to day running of a household). However, items from the repair or improvement of houses (e.g. DIY type waste) is classified as construction waste and there is no requirement for the council to provide any service for the disposal of this material or accept it free of charge. The Audit Commission also states that this type of waste (rubble and soil associated with rubble) is not household waste, so even if it is recycled it cannot be included in the household waste recycling figure.</p>
5.	How have you consulted on the proposal?	<p>We have consulted with Devon County Council. Since 1 April 2011 Devon County Council has charged for items that were previously free of charge at all its Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRRCs).</p> <p>Such a scheme could potentially generate objections from members of the public, but Devon County Council reported at its last Devon Environmental Service Managers Group on 14/7/11, that objections to their charging had settled down, with a decreasing number of complaints.</p> <p>We will advertising in the Herald Express and distribute leaflets at the recycling centre 1 month prior to implementation. Torbay Council's Website will also be updated.</p>
6.	Who have you consulted with?	As above
7.	How many people responded?	None
8.	Outline the key findings?	Not applicable
9.	What amendments may be required as a result	None likely

No	Question	Details
	of the consultation?	
10.	How will the results be published?	Not applicable

Stage 3: Impact Assessment

No	Question	Details
11.	Identify the potential positive and negative impacts on specific groups	
	All groups in society generally	<p>Positive Impact There is no disadvantage to vulnerable groups as a result of this change – assisted collections will still take place (for disabled/older people in the Bay)</p> <p>Negative Impact There is the possibility of increased fly tipping with some householders not wishing to pay the new charges, but since Devon County Council introduced its new scheme, fly tipping is only slightly higher than 12 month previous, as at June 2011.</p> <p>Such a scheme could potentially generate objections from members of the public, but Devon County Council reported at its last Devon Environmental Service managers group on 14/7/11, that objections to their charging had settled down, with a decreasing number of complaints.</p> <p>There is no disadvantage to vulnerable groups as a result of this change</p> <p>There is no disadvantage to people with caring responsibilities as a result of this change</p> <p>There is no disadvantage to vulnerable groups as a result of this change</p>
	Older or younger people	There is no disadvantage to vulnerable groups as a result of this change – assisted collections will still take place (for disabled/older people in the Bay)
	People with caring responsibilities	There is no disadvantage to people with caring responsibilities as a result of this change
	People with a disability	There is no disadvantage to vulnerable groups as a result of this change – assisted collections will still take place (for disabled/older people in the Bay)

No	Question	Details
	Women or men	There is no disadvantage to women or men as a result of this change
	People who are black or from a minority ethnic background (BME)	There is no disadvantage to BME groups as a result of this change
	People with particular religion or belief / no belief	There is no disadvantage to people with particular religion or belief groups as a result of this change
	People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual	There is no disadvantage to people who are lesbian, gay or bisexual as a result of this change
	People who are transgender	There is no disadvantage to people who are transgender as a result of this change
	People who are in a marriage or civil partnership	There is no disadvantage to people who are in a marriage or civil partnership result of this change
	Women who are pregnant / on maternity leave	There is no disadvantage to women who are pregnant / on maternity leave result of this change
12.	What are the impacts of your proposals to other agencies?	There is the possibility of increased fly tipping (although this is a serious offence) with some householders not wishing to pay the new charges, but since Devon County Council introduced its new scheme, fly tipping is only slightly higher than 12 month previous, as at June 2011. This may impact on TOR2 as they currently collect the fly tipping in the bay.
13.	Does your proposal link to other decisions you are making?	Links to RIO (Revenue Income Generation) project and waste minimisation policies
14.	Is there scope for your proposal to eliminate discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and/or foster good relations?	There is no disadvantage to vulnerable groups as a result of this change – assisted collections will still take place (for disabled/older people in the Bay) Having to pay for a service that was previously free, will make some people reconsider whether the decision to throw something away that is still perfectly functional is the right option, which is in itself more environmentally sustainable. Waste minimisation is at the top of the national waste hierarchy and is supported within Torbay's Municipal Waste Management

No	Question	Details
		Strategy.

Stage 4: Course of Action

No	Action	Details
15.	State a course of action	Outcome 1: No major change required - CIA has not identified any potential for adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.
16.	Identify any plans to alleviate any negative impacts	None – No negative impacts identified

Stage 5: Monitoring

No	Action	Details
17.	Outline plans to monitor the actual impact of proposals	<p>The full impact of decisions will only be known once it is introduced. We will monitor the impact of the proposal via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Customer complaints/feedback ▪ The amount of fly tipping incidents recorded

Notes:

- *The Equality Duty needs to be an integral part of the decision making process. Decision makers must consider what information he/she has and what further information may be needed in order to give proper consideration to the Equality Duty.*
- *Commissioned services – No delegation. Public bodies are responsible for ensuring that any third parties which exercise functions on their behalf are capable of complying with the Equality Duty, are required to comply with it and that they do so in practice.*

Action plan / mitigating actions

Please detail below any actions / mitigating actions you need to take: -

No.	Action	Reason for action / mitigating action	Responsibility	Deadline date
1	Placing of Herald Express Advert	To give people prior notice of the new charging structure	Ian Hartley	1 Month prior to implementation (implementation likely to be April)
2	Leaflet Distribution at the Recycling Centre	To give people prior notice of the new charging structure	Ian Hartley	1 Month prior to implementation (implementation likely to be April)
3	Torbay Council Website Updated	To give people prior notice of the new charging structure	Ian Hartley	1 Month prior to implementation (implementation likely to be April)
4				
5				
6				

This page is intentionally left blank

Budget Proposals 2012/13: Major Decision: Business Unit : Spatial Planning

Combined Impact Assessment: Full assessment (Part 2)

The council and its partners are facing a significant challenge in the savings it needs to make over the next couple of years. This Full Impact Assessment has been developed as a tool to enable business units to fully consider the impact of proposed major decisions on the community. As a council we need to ensure that we are able to deliver the savings that we need to make from the 1st April and be able to justify our decisions through any legal challenge.

This full assessment, combined with the initial review, will evidence that you have fully considered the impact of your proposed changes and carried out appropriate consultation on those changes with the key stakeholders. The Combined Impact Assessment will allow Councillors to make informed decisions as part of the decision-making process regarding the council's budget.

Name: Mark Irving/David Whiteway

**Position: Senior Service Manager - Customer Service & Planning/
Senior Transport Planner**

Business Unit: Place & Environment

Department: Spatial Planning

Date: January 2012

Summary from Overall Proposal (Updated as required)

Proposals – Outline	Savings 2012/13		Implementation Cost Include brief outline + year incurred	Delivery In place 01/04/12 If earlier or later state date	Risks / impact of proposals	Type of decision*		
	Income £ 000's	Budget reduction £ 000's				Internal	Minor	Major
Renegotiate Concessionary Fares Rate		400	£5,000 maximum	1/5/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential risks • Impact on community • Knock on impact to other agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Operators do not agree with cuts an appeal could be made • Cuts to services affecting less commercially viable routes • Could lead to Highways Department having to subsidise routes 			√

Stage 1: Purpose of the proposal

No	Question	Details
1.	Clearly set out the purpose of the proposal	Change the reimbursement rate to bus operators (6 affected) for concessionary fares as per Department for Transport guidance
2.	Who is intended to benefit/will this affect?	6 Bus Operators: Stagecoach, Local Link, First, Country Bus, Devonian Motor Services, Riverlink.
3.	What is the intended outcome?	Members of the public if these companies decide to cut routes Reduction of budget provision for concessionary fares by £400k. Apply DFT guidance in setting concessionary fares rates. Allow the Council to take strategic decisions on which services to support via subsidy.

Stage 2: Evidence, Consultation and Engagement

No	Question	Details
4.	Have you considered the available evidence?	DFT Guidance considered and applied with first letter outlining proposals sent to operators 22/12/11. We are now in a consultation phase in which operators can make their representations.
5.	How have you consulted on the proposal?	First letter outlining proposals sent to operators 22/12/11. We are now in a consultation phase in which operators can make their representations.

No	Question	Details																																														
6.	Who have you consulted with?	<p>6 Bus Operators: Stagecoach, Local Link, First, Country Bus, Devonian Motor Services, Riverlink</p> <p>Wider public budget consultation events have taken place. Questionnaires have also been issued to the public (online and paper copies) and the “viewpoint” panel have received copies of the questionnaire.</p> <p>Questionnaire Results:</p> <p>Renegotiate the concessionary bus fare. (Potential saving: £400,000)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="384 645 560 1697"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Questionnaires</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>81</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>168</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>249</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Public Meetings:</p> <p><u>Would you support a proposal to renegotiate the concessionary bus fare? (£400k)</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="735 607 1018 1697"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Venue</th> <th colspan="2">Yes</th> <th colspan="2">No</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Count</th> <th>%</th> <th>Count</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Westlands</td> <td>9</td> <td>90%</td> <td>1</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T.C.C</td> <td>10</td> <td>50%</td> <td>10</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Paignton</td> <td>18</td> <td>86%</td> <td>3</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dunboyne</td> <td>5</td> <td>71%</td> <td>2</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>42</td> <td>72%</td> <td>16</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Questionnaires	%	No	81	33%	Yes	168	67%	Grand Total	249		Venue	Yes		No		Count	%	Count	%	Westlands	9	90%	1	10%	T.C.C	10	50%	10	50%	Paignton	18	86%	3	14%	Dunboyne	5	71%	2	29%	Total	42	72%	16	28%
	Questionnaires	%																																														
No	81	33%																																														
Yes	168	67%																																														
Grand Total	249																																															
Venue	Yes		No																																													
	Count	%	Count	%																																												
Westlands	9	90%	1	10%																																												
T.C.C	10	50%	10	50%																																												
Paignton	18	86%	3	14%																																												
Dunboyne	5	71%	2	29%																																												
Total	42	72%	16	28%																																												
7.	How many people responded?	No formal responses received to date from 6 Bus Operators: Stagecoach, Local Link, First, Country Bus, Devonian Motor Services, Riverlink. Please see data above for public questionnaires and public meetings.																																														
8.	Outline the key findings?	Too early in the process to say regarding the formal responses from 6 Bus Operators: Stagecoach, Local Link, First, Country Bus, Devonian Motor Services, Riverlink but key findings will be considered prior to final decision. Please see above for the public consultation results.																																														

No	Question	Details
9.	What amendments may be required as a result of the consultation?	Amount of reduction in reimbursement rates may be renegotiated. Council may choose to subsidise services.
10.	How will the results be published?	A letter will be sent to all affected operators 28 days prior to implementation informing them of the final reimbursement rates. Bus companies are required to provide 56 days notice to the traffic commissioner to make any changes to bus routes. This 56 day period gives the Council an opportunity to consider subsidising any threatened routes.

Stage 3: Impact Assessment

No	Question	Details
11.	Identify the potential positive and negative impacts on specific groups	
	All groups in society generally	Positive Impact No direct impact
	Older or younger people	Negative Impact There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement. This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle. There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement. This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle.
	People with caring responsibilities	Positive Impact No direct impact
	People with a disability	Negative Impact There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement. This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle. There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to

No	Question	Details
		reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement.
	Women or men	This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle. There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement.
	No direct impact	This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle.
	People who are black or from a minority ethnic background (BME)	There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement.
	No direct impact	This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle.
	People with particular religion or belief / no belief	There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement.
	No direct impact	This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle.
	People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual	There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement.
	No direct impact	This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle.
	People who are transgender	There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement.
	No direct impact	This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle.
	People who are in a	There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to

No	Question	Details
	marriage or civil partnership	reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement.
	Women who are pregnant / on maternity leave	<p>This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle.</p> <p>No direct impact</p> <p>There is the possibility that bus operators may decide to reduce or remove services as a result of the reduction to concessionary fares reimbursement.</p> <p>This would impact most significantly on those without access to a private vehicle.</p>
12.	What are the impacts of your proposals to other agencies?	At this stage there are no impacts foreseen, however if operators subsequently cut services groups that represent vulnerable people may need to be consulted over subsidy decisions.
13.	Does your proposal link to other decisions you are making?	Links to the Local Transport Plan 3 and current bids to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.
14.	Is there scope for your proposal to eliminate discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and/or foster good relations?	<p>Bus operators may subsequently reduce or remove services which would impact significantly on those without access to a private vehicle – this could be mitigated by providing a bus subsidy to routes affected.</p> <p>There is therefore limited opportunity to achieve any of these outcomes as a result of this proposal.</p>

Stage 4: Course of Action

No	Action	Details
15.	State a course of action	Outcome 1: No major change required - CIA has not identified any potential for adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken. This may need to be reviewed following negotiations has taken place with operators. This could include a detailed impact assessment due to the proposed closure of specific bus route(s).
16.	Identify any plans to alleviate any negative impacts	Amount of reduction in reimbursement rates may be renegotiated. Council may choose to subsidise services. Increased of community bus services could be employed

Stage 5: Monitoring

No	Action	Details
17.	Outline plans to monitor the actual impact of proposals	The full impact of decisions will only be known once it is introduced. We will monitor the impact of the proposal via: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer complaints/feedback • Bus operator feedback • Budget monitoring of actual reduced level of reimbursement to bus operators • Notifications to the traffic commissioner to make any changes to bus routes • Monitoring of bus patronage and access to services via public transport

COMBINED IMPACT ASSESSMENT (PARTS 1 & 2) NEEDS TO BE SENT TO THE BUSINESS SERVICES TEAM FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE. IT WILL THEN BE SENT TO THE FINANCE BOARD AND USED AS PART OF THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS BY COUNCILLORS.

Notes:

- The Equality Duty needs to be an integral part of the decision making process. Decision makers must consider what information he/she has and what further information may be needed in order to give proper consideration to the Equality Duty.
- Commissioned services – No delegation. Public bodies are responsible for ensuring that any third parties which exercise functions on their behalf are capable of complying with the Equality Duty, are required to comply with it and that they do so in practice.

Action plan / mitigating actions

Please detail below any actions / mitigating actions you need to take: -

No.	Action	Reason for action / mitigating action	Responsibility	Deadline date
1	Initial letter to bus operator notifying them of consultation on proposal	To give operators prior notice of proposed changes to reimbursement rates	DW	Completed on 22/12/11
2	Consultation Period	Receive representations from bus operators regarding the proposed changes to reimbursement rates	DW	Responses required by the end of March 2012
3	Formal 28 day notification of outcome of consultation	To give operators final notice of adopted changes to reimbursement rates	DW	02/04/12
4	Bus operators to provide 56 days notice to the traffic commissioner to make any changes to bus routes	To inform the traffic commissioner to make any changes to bus routes (reductions in frequency or services removed)	Bus Operators	56 days prior to their implementation
5	Council may consider subsidising threatened services	To take a Council wide decision on whether or not to protect threatened bus services in the context of other budget pressures.	PC	To be confirmed
6				

Spatial Planning

Tuesday 17th January 2012



Waste Recycling Credits

**BUDGET
2012 / 2013**

**TOUGH DECISIONS
YOUR SERVICES**

**HAVE
YOUR SAY!**

The graphic features a black background with a red border. At the top, the text "BUDGET 2012 / 2013" is written in a bold, red, sans-serif font. Below this, the text "TOUGH DECISIONS YOUR SERVICES" is written in a bold, white, sans-serif font. To the right of this text is a white speech bubble with a red border containing the text "HAVE YOUR SAY!" in a bold, red, sans-serif font. At the bottom of the graphic, there is a collage of various banknotes, including a 100 Euro note and a 1000 Japanese Yen note.

Consultation Overview

- Groups affected: -
 - Charity and community groups that claim credits.
- Consultation undertaken: -
 - Affected groups notified via letter with a 6 week notice of the decision.
 - 5 responses received - no objections or complaints were made only enquiries regarding the last date for submission of final claim.



Impact Assessment Overview

- **Key Impacts**
 - Charity/community groups (e.g. The Scouts) no longer receive funding.
 - Organisations still able to receive income from recycling companies i.e. Furniture can still be collected.
 - Renegotiation on price received for raw materials may be possible thereby minimising the potential for impact.
- **Outcome: Adjustments made to remove barriers**
 - Community groups receive £15 per ton for paper from recycling companies. Taking away credit of £57.76 was deemed disproportionate. This will be continued at least for 2011/12 financial year.



Charging for Waste Rubble or Similar Material



**BUDGET
2012 / 2013**

**TOUGH DECISIONS
YOUR SERVICES**

**HAVE
YOUR SAY!**

The graphic features a black background with a red border. At the top left, the text 'BUDGET 2012 / 2013' is written in a bold, red, sans-serif font. Below this, the text 'TOUGH DECISIONS YOUR SERVICES' is written in a bold, white, sans-serif font. To the right of this text is a white speech bubble with a red border containing the text 'HAVE YOUR SAY!' in a bold, red, sans-serif font. At the bottom of the graphic, there is a collage of various banknotes, including a 10 Euro note and a 100 Euro note, with a hand holding a 10 Euro note.

Consultation Overview

- **Consultation undertaken:** -
 - Devon County Council (D.C.C) - charged for items since 1 April 2011.
 - D.C.C reported objections to charging settled down by mid July 2011 with decreasing number of complaints.
- **Notification of new charging structure for Torbay:**
 - Advertisement in Herald Express
 - Leaflet distribution at the Recycling Centre
 - Torbay Council's website will also be updated.
 - To give people prior notice of the new charging structure 1 month prior to implementation.



Impact Assessment Overview

- **Key Impacts:** -
 - No disadvantage to vulnerable groups
 - Assisted collections will still take place (for disabled/older people in the Bay)
 - Possibility of increased fly tipping – may impact on TOR2 who collect fly tipping in Bay
 - Positive impact of people reconsidering decision to throw something away
- **Outcome: No major change required**
 - CIA has not identified any potential for adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.



Renegotiate Concessionary Fares



**BUDGET
2012 / 2013**

**TOUGH DECISIONS
YOUR SERVICES**

**HAVE
YOUR SAY!**

The graphic features a black background with a red stamp-like border containing the text 'BUDGET 2012 / 2013'. Below this, the text 'TOUGH DECISIONS YOUR SERVICES' is written in white, bold, uppercase letters. To the right, a white speech bubble with a red outline contains the text 'HAVE YOUR SAY!' in red, bold, uppercase letters. The bottom right corner of the graphic shows a collage of various banknotes.

Consultation Overview

- Consultation undertaken: -
 - General Public Budget Consultation
 - 6 Bus Operators: Stagecoach, Local Link, First, Country Bus, Devonian Motor Services, Riverlink (early stages of consultation)
- Key findings:-
 - 67% of respondents from the general public budget consultation (questionnaire results) said they would support a proposal to renegotiate concessionary fares.



Impact Assessment Overview

- **Key impacts:** -
 - Reduced income for bus operating companies.
 - Bus companies may increase fares.
 - Bus companies may cut less commercially viable routes.
 - Potential knock on effect - all bus users
 - Impact people/families on low incomes, live in deprived areas.
 - Reduce mobility for people without cars.
 - Potential impact on all equality groups
- **Outcome** - No major change required - CIA has not identified any potential for adverse impact. All opportunities to promote equality have been taken. This may need to be reviewed following negotiations has taken place with operators.

**BUDGET
2012 / 2013**

**TOUGH DECISIONS
YOUR SERVICES**

**HAVE
YOUR SAY!**



Issues for Members to Consider

- **Concessionary fares**
- Further consultation needs to take place with operators
- There may be a risk of not making the full year saving as a result of:
 - the 28 day notification period (i.e. not a full year saving as commencement 01/05/12)
 - Additional cost in subsidising routes if deemed no longer viable by operators



This page is intentionally left blank