

Public Document Pack



NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting	Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee
Date and Time	Tuesday, 17th September, 2019 at 10.00 am
Place	Mitchell Room - HCC
Enquiries to	members.services@hants.gov.uk

John Coughlan CBE
Chief Executive
The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UJ

FILMING AND BROADCAST NOTIFICATION

This meeting may be recorded and broadcast live on the County Council's website. The meeting may also be recorded and broadcast by the press and members of the public – please see the Filming Protocol available on the County Council's website.

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members who believe they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting must declare that interest and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3 Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter is discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore all Members with a Non-Pecuniary interest in a matter being considered at the meeting should consider whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 2 of the Code, consider whether it is appropriate to leave the meeting while the matter is discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 3 - 8)

To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting

4. DEPUTATIONS

To receive any deputations notified under Standing Order 12.

5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

To receive any announcements the Chairman may wish to make.

6. TRANSFORMATION TO 2021 - REVENUE SAVINGS PROPOSALS
(Pages 9 - 54)

To consider a report from the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, which asks the Select Committee to scrutinise savings proposals for the Economy, Transport and Environment budget that have been developed as part of the Transformation to 2021 (Tt2021) Programme.

7. CYCLING STRATEGY UPDATE (Pages 55 - 64)

To consider a report from the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, which updates Committee on key issues raised in October 2018 regarding cycling in Hampshire and recommend next steps.

8. CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN

To receive a verbal update on progress towards the Climate Change Action Plan.

9. WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 65 - 70)

To review and agree the upcoming work programme and discuss any potential items that the Select Committee may wish to review.

ABOUT THIS AGENDA:

On request, this agenda can be provided in alternative versions (such as large print, Braille or audio) and in alternative languages.

ABOUT THIS MEETING:

The press and public are welcome to attend the public sessions of the meeting. If you have any particular requirements, for example if you require wheelchair access, please contact members.services@hants.gov.uk for assistance.

County Councillors attending as appointed members of this Committee or by virtue of Standing Order 18.5; or with the concurrence of the Chairman in connection with their duties as members of the Council or as a local County Councillor qualify for travelling expenses.

Agenda Item 3

AT A MEETING of the Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee
of HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL held at the castle, Winchester on Tuesday
4th June, 2019

Chairman:

* Councillor Russell Oppenheimer

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| * Councillor Graham Burgess | * Councillor Stephen Philpott |
| * Councillor John Bennison | * Councillor David Simpson |
| * Councillor Roland Dibbs | * Councillor Michael Thierry |
| * Councillor Gary Hughes | * Councillor Martin Tod |
| * Councillor Rupert Kyrle | * Councillor Michael White |
| * Councillor Derek Mellor | * Councillor Bill Withers Lt Col (Retd) |
| * Councillor Floss Mitchell | |

*Present

Also present with the agreement of the Chairman: Councillor Rob Humby

87. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

All Members were present and no apologies were noted.

88. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter considered at the meeting they must declare that interest at the time of the relevant debate and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3, Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Non-Pecuniary interest in a matter being considered at the meeting they considered whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 2 of the Code, considered whether it was appropriate to leave the meeting whilst the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

89. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Under matters arising it was confirmed that the letter from the Leader regarding the Government Waste Strategy Consultation had been circulated to Members. The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and agreed.

90. DEPUTATIONS

There were no deputations for the meeting.

91. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Humby was welcomed to the meeting and congratulated on his new role as the Deputy Leader. The Chairman also confirmed that a Cabinet meeting was scheduled for the 17 June, which would focus on climate change.

92. **HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT FLOOD AND COASTAL EROSION RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR ENGLAND**

The Committee considered a presentation and report from Simon Cramp, Environmental Initiatives Manager (item 6 in the minute book), which asked Committee to scrutinise the consultation on the Draft National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy launched by the Government on 9 May 2019.

The officer described how climate change predictions indicated that the UK would experience wetter winters and drier summers, with an increased likelihood of more intense rainfall leading to flooding. Additionally, the continuing sea level rise and increased storminess will have profound impacts for the coastline. The scale of potential future flooding and coastal change was significant and therefore the Risk Management Strategy was created to help alleviate the concerns.

The Strategy was an ambitious agenda for the County Council requiring a great deal of strategic planning to influence the direction of the strategy.

A great deal of investment had been made since 2014, with £6 million being spent in Bursledon and £6.6 million in Romsey, largely paid for by the County Council due to lack of government funding. More was expected across the County going forward.

During questions, members learned that:

- A coordinated approach was important going forward, working with the Flood Committees;
- Water management was important and water bodies attended and participated in the Regional Flood and Coastal Committees. Their focus was on reducing demand rather than increasing supply;
- Lots of areas of Hampshire would be looked at and assessed, including Lepe and Lymington;
- It was important to ensure that alleviating risk in one area did not create a funnel effect and cause potential issues elsewhere, so investing in infrastructure and resilience was crucial;
- Natural flood management proposals were being looked at, which would be lower cost to the County Council;

Members acknowledged that flooding and climate change was an issue that affected everyone and something that needed prioritisation.

RESOLVED:

The Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee supported the

recommendations being proposed to the Executive Member for Environment and Transport in paragraphs 2-4 (page 1) of the attached report; being:

- a) *That the Executive Member for Environment and Transport notes the content and potential impacts of the Government's consultation on the Draft National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy and endorses the key principles to form a basis for the County Council's detailed response, as set out in paragraphs 13-24 of the supporting report.*
- b) *That the Executive Member for Environment and Transport approves the next steps for submission set out in the supporting report.*
- c) *That authority is delegated to the Director of Economy, Transport, and Environment to make all necessary arrangements to approve and submit the detailed response to Government in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Transport.*

93. **FLY-TIPPING UPDATE**

The Select Committee received a presentation from Gareth Roberts, Senior Project Officer (item 7 in the minute book) with an update on the reduction and management of fly-tipping in Hampshire.

Members learned that a recent arrest had been made for fly-tipping on a large scale through organised crime with several vehicles seized.

Through Joint Operations with partners such as the Environment Agency and Hampshire Constabulary, 600 vehicles were stop-checked in 2018, which was well received by the public. CCTV had also been installed across several Hampshire areas to discourage offenders, with signs put up as a deterrent.

The Intelligence and Enforcement Working Group had continued to meet on a quarterly basis. The group included various partners and was an opportunity to discuss best practice and share intelligence. It was also where new ideas and schemes were discussed and agreed.

The number of reported incidents appeared to have increased according to the Project Integra chart, but in some events this was due to changes in the way some local authorities had recorded incidents. A recent media campaign¹ had encouraged people to check waste collectors were licensed, along with report fly-tipping and whilst there had been more reports, the tonnage of fly-tipping had decreased according to 2017/18 figures.

Officers had been liaising with private land owners to ensure that any material fly-tipped on their land was left alone and reported so that evidence could be gathered to assist with investigation and secure convictions. There had also been extensive engagement with HALC (Hampshire Association of Local Councils) to support Parish Councils with initiatives in their local areas.

During questions, Members learned that:

¹ <https://www.hants.gov.uk/fly-tipping>

- Research was being done to try and improve the recording process with fly-tipping and discount duplicate reports, as done with Highways and potholes;
- The tonnage data for 2018/19 was currently being processed and anticipated to be available in November 2019;
- CCTV was approximately £180 with signage costs in addition;
- There was nothing specific to fly-tipping under the Magistrate Sentencing Guidelines and so the criteria for prosecutions varied, meaning evidence was crucial to ascertain convictions.

Officers were thanked for their hard work and Councillor Humby was thanked for championing the work and progress to date.

Members agreed that a further update be added to the Work Programme for June 2020.

94. **STRATEGIC TRANSPORT UPDATE**

Cllr Kyrle left the meeting

The Select Committee received a presentation from Keith Wilcox, Assistant Director of Transport; David Wilson, Head of Implementation and Frank Baxter, Head of Integrated Transport (item 8 in the minute book) on strategic transport.

Members learned that everyday in Hampshire 450,000 people drove to work with 96% of daily journeys being made on roads, cycle ways and footways. The roads in Hampshire stretched 5344 miles. The highway network was the life blood of the economy and therefore it was crucial it was well maintained.

The Transport for South East (TfSE) was a regional transport strategy that covered 7.5 million people and two national parks (slide 7). It supported good economic growth and enabled joined-up proposals to be investigated for greater benefit across the south. Hampshire also worked closely with the Solent and EM3 LEPs on economic strategies, which supplied a lot of funding to Hampshire County Council major projects.

Passenger transport was another large area for strategic transport with 31 millions bus passengers, 91,000 Dial-A-Ride trips per annum and a recorded 250,000 concessionary pass holders (slide 11). Hampshire had been the first Shire County to release a contactless payment option on buses, and there had been 5 million contactless journeys to date. There had been a big development with journey planning and real time technology, and with the installation off WiFi on many services, it was making public transport more desirable than ever before.

Members were taken through the process of major schemes and how they are planned and implemented, with the Gosport BRT and Botley Bypass used as examples (slides 16 and 18). Officers also discussed the details behind specific works like the Basingstoke BRT and Waterside, as part of the proposed port expansion (slide 23).

Looking ahead, there were considerations regarding the LTP and whether it needed updating to accommodate policy and governance changes effecting highways, funding and the environment as a whole. (slide 31).

Officers and Members were pleased that there had been some great successes over recent years, but acknowledged the need to be agile, flexible, commercial and innovative in changing times with a changing agenda.

During questions, Members learned:

- Local roads were also taken into account when doing major schemes and improved if necessary;
- Work was continuing regarding the adoption of private roads where applicable.;
- Research was still being done on the details and benefits to the location of the M3/M4 link road;
- Local cycling and walking plans were incorporated into the local strategies;
- Highways England had concluded that the improvements proposed for Junction 6 of the M3 had cost benefits but traffic conditions had also improved;
- There were bids planned to help connectivity across Basingstoke and work would continue.

Officers were thanked for their presentation and hard work and for maintaining Hampshire's high profile with the highways work. Councillor Humby congratulated Stuart Jarvis for his effective leadership.

95. **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Select Committee considered the Work Programme (item 9 in the minute book) and several items were proposed to be added to the schedule:

- Recycled products (James Potter and Veolia to present) – January 2020
- Highways England presentation – January 2020
- Review of street lighting and any connection with crime – June 2020.
- Fly-tipping update – June 2020

RESOLVED:

The Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee approved the attached work programme, with the inclusion of the subjects discussed at the meeting (listed above).

Chairman,

This page is intentionally left blank

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Report

Committee:	Economy, Transport, and Environment Select Committee
Date:	17 September 2019
Title:	Transformation to 2021 – Revenue Savings Proposals
Report From:	Director of Economy, Transport, and Environment and Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources

Contact name: Sue Lapham

Tel: 01962 847804

Email: sue.lapham@hants.gov.uk

Purpose of this Report

1. The purpose of this report is to outline the detailed savings proposals for the Economy, Transport and Environment budget that have been developed as part of the Transformation to 2021 (Tt2021) Programme.
2. The report also provides details of the Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) that have been produced in respect of these proposals and highlights where applicable, any key issues arising from the public consultation exercise that was carried out over the summer and how these have impacted on the final proposals presented in this report.
3. The Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment is requested to approve the detailed savings proposals for submission to Cabinet in October and then full County Council in November, recognising that there will be further public consultation for some proposals.

Recommendations

That the Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee consider the detailed savings proposals and:

Either:

4. Support the recommendations being proposed to the Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment in section 2 of the report.

Or:

5. Agree any alternative recommendations equivalent in value to the required Transformation to 2021 total, to the Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment with regards to the budget proposals set out in the report.

6. Agree any feedback or comments relating to the Select Committee's recommendations for consideration by the Executive Member for Economy, Transport, and Environment when making their decision

DRAFT

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Decision Report

Decision Maker:	Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment
Date:	17 September 2019
Title:	Transformation to 2021 – Revenue Savings Proposals
Report From:	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment and Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources

Contact name: Stuart Jarvis
Sue Lapham

Tel: 01962 845260 **Email:** stuart.jarvis@hants.gov.uk
01962 847804 sue.lapham@hants.gov.uk

Purpose of this Report

1. The purpose of this report is to outline the detailed savings proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment that have been developed as part of the Transformation to 2021 (Tt2021) Programme.

Recommendation

2. To approve the submission of the proposed savings options contained in this report and Appendix 1 to the Cabinet.

Executive Summary

3. The purpose of this report is to outline the detailed savings proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment that have been developed as part of the Transformation to 2021 (Tt2021) Programme.
4. The report also provides details of the Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) that have been produced in respect of these proposals and highlights where applicable, any key issues arising from the public consultation exercise that was carried out over the summer and how these have impacted on the final proposals presented in this report.
5. The Executive Member is requested to approve the detailed savings proposals for submission to Cabinet in October and then full County Council in November 2019 recognising that there will be further public consultation for some proposals.

Contextual information

DRAFT

6. Members will be fully aware that the County Council has been responding to reductions in public spending, designed to close the structural deficit within the economy, since the first reductions to government grants were applied in 2010/11 and then as part of subsequent Comprehensive Spending Reviews (CSRs).
7. Whilst the County Council understands the wider economic imperative for closing the structural deficit, the prolonged period of tight financial control has led to significant reductions in government grant and the removal of funding that was historically provided to cover inflation, coupled with continued underfunding for demand pressures. At the same time the County Council has also had to respond to inflationary and growth driven increases in costs across all services, but in particular adults' and children's social care.
8. One of the key features of the County Council's well documented financial strategy and previous savings programmes has been the ability to plan well in advance, take decisions early and provide the time and capacity to properly implement savings so that a full year impact is derived in the financial year that they are needed.
9. This strategy has enabled the County Council to cushion some of the most difficult implications of the financial changes which have affected the short term financial viability of some County Councils, with Surrey previously considering a referendum for a 15% council tax increase and the well publicised financial issues facing Northamptonshire whose Director of Finance issued a Section 114 notice in February 2018, imposing spending controls on the council.
10. This approach has also meant that savings have often been implemented in anticipation of immediate need providing resources both corporately and to individual departments to fund investment in capital assets and to fund further change and transformation programmes to deliver the next wave of savings.
11. Whilst this has been a key feature of previous cost reduction programmes it was recognised that the Transformation to 2021 (Tt2021) Programme, the fifth major cost reduction exercise for the County Council since 2010, would be even more challenging than any previous transformation and efficiency programme against the backdrop of a generally more challenging financial environment and burgeoning service demands.
12. Unsurprisingly, the Tt2021 Programme is building seamlessly on from the Transformation to 2019 (Tt2019) Programme, with projects and programmes of work set to go further and harder in a number of areas as the search for an additional £80m of savings (combining cost reduction and income generation) develops.
13. The Tt2021 work has been taken forward without any impacts for Tt2019 delivery with the Corporate Management Team (CMT) setting appropriate time aside for the Tt2021 planning process whilst maintaining a continued strong grip on Tt2019.
14. What is different to previous years however is the fact that the profile of delivery for the Tt2019 Programme is back loaded, with some changes not being delivered at all until well after 2019/20. Secured savings exceeded the £100m mark in the first quarter of 2019 which represented another major

DRAFT

milestone for the Programme. However, this leaves £40m to deliver and as we move ahead we know that the remaining savings areas will be the most difficult to secure.

15. Whilst sufficient resources have been set aside to cover this delayed implementation the need to commence the successor programme does therefore mean that there will be overlapping change programmes which is another significant difference. This does increase the overall risk in the budget going forward and there is clearly no room for complacency especially as implementation and delivery of Tt2021 will begin to run alongside the Tt2019 Programme and strong focus will be required to ensure simultaneous delivery of both.
16. Departments have looked closely at potential opportunities to achieve the required savings and unsurprisingly the exercise has been extremely challenging because savings of £480m have already been driven out over the past nine years, and the fact that the size of the target (a further 13% reduction in departmental cash limited budgets) requires a complete “re-look”; with previously discounted options having to be re-considered. It has been a significant challenge for all departments to develop a set of proposals that, together, can enable their share of the Tt2021 Programme target to be delivered.
17. The opportunity assessment and planning work has confirmed the sheer complexity and challenge behind some of the proposals, which means in a number of areas more than two years will be required to develop plans and implement the specific service changes.
18. The cashflow support required to manage the extended delivery timetable for the Tt2021 Programme will in the most part be met from departmental cost of change reserves but further funding of £32m to provide for necessary investment and the later delivery has already been factored into the requirements for the Grant Equalisation Reserve going forward. This provision will be considered as part of the updated Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) that will be reported in October.
19. The County Council undertook an open public consultation called *Serving Hampshire – Balancing the Budget* which ran for six weeks between 5 June – 17 July. The consultation was widely promoted to stakeholders and residents and asked for their views on ways the County Council could balance its budget in response to continuing pressures on local government funding, and still deliver core public services.
20. The consultation was clear that a range of options would be needed to deliver the required £80m of savings by 2021. Therefore, whilst each option offers a valid way of contributing in-part to balancing the budget – plugging the estimated £80m gap in full will inevitably require a combination of approaches. For example, the Information Pack illustrated the amount of savings that would still be required even if council tax was increased by up to 10%. It explained that the £80m estimated budget shortfall took into account an assumed increase in ‘core’ council tax of 4.99% in both 2020/21 and 2021/22. The Pack also explained that if central government were to support changing local government arrangements in Hampshire, savings would still take several years to be realised. Residents were similarly made aware that

DRAFT

the use of reserves would only provide a temporary fix, providing enough money to run services for around 27 days.

21. As the consultation feedback confirms, a number of different approaches are likely to still be needed to meet the scale of the financial challenge. Consequently, the County Council will seek to:
- **continue with its financial strategy**, which includes:
 - **targeting resources** on the most vulnerable adults and children
 - **using reserves carefully** to help meet one-off demand pressures
 - **maximise income generation** opportunities;
 - **lobby central government** for legislative change to enable charging for some services;
 - **minimise reductions and changes to local services** wherever possible, including by raising council tax by 4.99%;
 - consider further the opportunities for **changing local government arrangements** in Hampshire.
22. Executive Members and Chief Officers have been provided with the key findings from the consultation to help in their consideration of the final savings proposals for this report. Responses to the consultation will similarly help to inform the decision making by Cabinet and Full Council in October and November of 2019 on options for delivering a balanced budget up to 2021/22, which the Authority is required by law to do.
23. In addition, Equality Impact Assessments have also been produced for all of the detailed savings proposals and these together with the broad outcomes of the consultation and the development work on the overall Tt2021 Programme have helped to shape the final proposals presented for approval in this report.

Budget Update

24. Members will be aware that 2019/20 represented the final year of the current Spending Review period and that no indication has previously been provided by Government about the prospects for local government finance beyond this time. Although a further 4 year Spending Review had originally been planned for the summer of this year, this was impacted by Brexit and the national political situation.
25. In recent years, significant lobbying of the Government has been undertaken by Hampshire and the wider local government sector in order to ask them to address the financial pressures we are facing and to convince them to provide an early indication of the financial position beyond 2019/20 to aid medium term financial planning and to address the more immediate issue of budget setting for 2020/21. Whilst the news of a single year settlement was not welcome, it was not unexpected and was partly balanced by the promise of an early indication of the 'settlement' for local government.
26. The Spending Round announcement took place on 4 September and the key issues from a Hampshire perspective were:

DRAFT

- £2.5bn nationally for the continuation of existing one-off grants across social care services (worth around £38.5m to Hampshire) most of which had already been assumed in the MTFS.
 - An extra £1bn for adults' and children's social care services, representing between £15m and £20m to Hampshire depending on the distribution methodology, which will be consulted upon.
 - Core council tax of 2% and the continuation of a 2% adult social care precept. This is below our assumptions in the MTFS and would lose the County Council around £12m of recurring income over the two years of the Tt2021 Programme.
 - Additional funding for schools, which includes extra funding for Special Educational Needs of £700m. If this was distributed on the same basis as previous additional grant, our share would be around £16.8m and would help to address the future growth in this area but does not provide a solution to the cumulative deficit position schools will face at the end of 2019/20.
27. The content of the proposed settlement and the issues it addressed were pleasing to see as they mirrored the key issues that we have been consistently raising for some time directly with the Government and through our local MPs.
28. In overall terms, there is a net resource gain to the County council, albeit that is only for one year at this stage. However, the cost pressures we face, particularly in adults and children's social care services are significantly outstripping the forecasts that were included in the original Tt2021 planning figures.
29. Without the additional injection of funding, the County Council would have faced a revised deficit position well in excess of £100m by 2021/22, but the additional resources bring us back to a broadly neutral position.
30. More detail will be provided in the update of the MTFS and as part of the Member briefings that will take place as part of the Tt2021 decision making process.

Transformation to 2021 – Departmental Context

31. The Economy Transport and Environment (ETE) Department is responsible for a range of services, including highways maintenance and improvement, traffic management, subsidised public and community transport, waste disposal and recycling, minerals and waste planning, flood risk management, economic development and specialist environmental services. Most of these services are statutory, i.e. required by law, and there is requirement to maintain a base level of funding to meet our statutory requirements.
32. ETE has already made savings since 2011 totalling £56.5m, including real term reductions in operational budgets, increased income from charges and recharges, and reductions in core full time equivalent (FTE) posts by 24%. The requirement for 2021 is to identify and deliver a further £11.748m of savings against the net budget of £102.856m approved in February 2019.

DRAFT

33. External spend, i.e. money paid to third parties to provide services, accounts for over 70% of the Department's gross spend. For the 2015 and 2017 savings programmes, the Department's strategy was to maximise savings from external spend. This proved successful, with the majority of savings coming from this workstream whilst still delivering good services. This involved either renegotiating, re-letting or refinancing all of our major contracts, including highways, waste disposal, Household Waste Recycling Centre management, street lighting, Intelligent Transport Systems, bus subsidies, and all our District Agency Agreements. This collective scale of savings cannot be achieved again until the contracts are renewed, and this will take us into the mid 2020s onwards.
34. As a result of the changes and savings already made from 2011-2019, the Department's scope to secure further savings is increasingly limited. All budgets have been looked at and details of the savings proposals under consideration for 2021 are shown in the rest of this section. The proposals and their potential impact are also set out in Appendix 1 and the references to individual proposals (e.g. ETE1) are included in the following paragraphs where applicable. The department has five proposals for 2021, two of which will directly affect the public (outlined in paragraphs 39 and 41) which would require a detailed stage two public consultation before any final decisions could be made on them.
35. Two proposals relate to the County Council's waste disposal statutory duties. The most significant proposal, in terms of scale, is proposed to come via the waste contract (recycling and other efficiencies - £8.2m) where the County Council has to arrange for the disposal of waste collected by District Councils. There are several elements to this proposal that include saving derived from increased operational efficiencies and the potential for negotiated contract variations. However, in order to deliver the full savings required there is a need to review, and revise, the existing arrangements for recycling between the County Council, as a statutory Waste Disposal Authority and Hampshire's District and Borough Councils as Waste Collection Authorities that have been in place, without significant update, since the inception of the Project Integra Partnership in the mid -1990's.
36. It is proposed to make changes including no longer subsidising aspects of the recycling systems run by District Councils to reduce costs to the County Council through a more financially sustainable model. The proposals will require a new financial framework within the Project Integra arrangements though the details will need to be worked through in the context of national changes being proposed.
37. The proposed changes will also support moves to adapt waste systems and infrastructure in line with emerging Government changes. There remains some uncertainty over the exact nature of any service changes at present due to proposed changes to recycling and waste collection services being considered by the Government, that have been the subject of a consultation process in early 2019 and are likely to be subject to further consultations in early 2020 with implementation unlikely to be before the mid 2020s however it remains important in the meantime to deliver the necessary savings which are not dependent on confirmation of detailed implementation proposals.

DRAFT

38. There should be no impact on residents from the County Council's proposals, whilst the Government's stated intention is to harmonise and simplify the arrangements for recycling and residual waste collections.
39. The second proposal relates to the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs), at which the County Council continues to allow householders to deposit non-household waste but seeks to protect the overall service by recovering the cost of managing and disposing of such material through levying a charge on users bringing in the materials. It is proposed to recover costs by charging customers to dispose of non-household wood waste (£1.0m), e.g., fence panels, sheds, window frames etc. However, again we are aware that the Government is minded to review and then consult on future HWRC services. This is expected to occur in 2020.
40. It is proposed to make modest savings to the Highways service (£0.5m) through an alternative funding model for the Parish Lengthsmen scheme (Parish Lengthsmen carry out straightforward highways maintenance tasks requested by the local parish council), and/or other Highways Contract efficiencies. These are not anticipated to have any impact on residents.
41. Further reductions in the energy cost of managing Hampshire's street lighting network are also proposed (£0.5m), principally via opportunities offered through advances in technology. There may also be a requirement to extend part-night lighting for longer periods or additional areas than those introduced under the 2019 savings, and/or some additional dimming of the streetlights.
42. The remainder of the savings is proposed from changes to the department's operating model (£1.548m), the principal focus of which is income generation from trading and charging activities that were also key components of the 2019 savings programme. The trading offer focuses on increasing the net contribution from selling services to external organisations, and the charging proposal builds on the full-cost recovery approach for discretionary activities introduced in the 2019 programme. Any residual savings are planned from a reduced headcount of revenue-funded staff by up to 15-25 full time equivalent posts based on average budgeted salary costs. The department would seek to minimise the impact on staff through the use of vacancy management, natural turnover, redeployment of staff where possible, and exploring voluntary redundancy where appropriate. All the operating model proposals would need to be underpinned by further increases in productivity from, for example, digital tools and business process reviews.
43. The proposals set out in paragraphs 35-42 above combine to make the £11.748m target for ETE. Two service areas have a saving that could achieve further benefits subject to legislative change. In general terms, this would be in line with headline results from the recent 'Balancing the Budget 2019 Consultation', in which the top two preferred options from the 5,432 responses were 1) generating additional income and 2) lobbying central Government for legislative change. Specifically on the latter, the response for lobbying for changes on individual services were as follows – older person bus pass (66% agreed / 29% disagreed); 25% charge of each concessionary fare (42% agreed / 43% disagreed), £1 per visit to local HWRCs (40% agreed, 56% disagreed).

DRAFT

Summary Financial Implications

44. The savings target that was set for Economy, Transport and Environment was £11.748m and the detailed savings proposals that are being put forward to meet this target are contained in Appendix 1.
45. £10.2m (87%) of these savings are currently expected to be delivered on time with £850,000 forecast to be achieved ahead of target.
46. In addition to funding for the wider implementation of the overall programme, £1.548m has been set aside in the Department's Cost of Change reserve to cover timing shortfalls currently anticipated in the following areas:
 - Street lighting, where the potential need for investment in new technology would mean the full value of the saving not being achieved by 2021/22.
 - Highways, to allow time for alternative funding to be confirmed for the Parish Lengthsmen scheme.
 - Operating model, to enable development of sustainable new trading activity.

Workforce Implications

47. Appendix 1 also provides information on the estimated number of reductions in staffing as a result of implementing the proposals.
48. Up to 15 - 25 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) posts may be affected by the proposals and it is anticipated that savings would be achieved as far as possible through vacancy management and natural turnover within the relevant services although this may not be sufficient to meet the reduction required.
49. The County Council's approach to managing down staff levels in a planned and sensitive way through the use of managed recruitment, redeployment of staff where possible and voluntary redundancy where appropriate will be continued. The County Council will ensure appropriate consultation with staff and trade unions about workforce implications at the appropriate time and in accordance with County Council policies and procedures.

Consultation, Decision Making and Equality Impact Assessments

50. As part of its prudent financial strategy, the County Council has been planning since June 2018 how it might tackle the anticipated deficit in its budget by 2021/22. As part of the MTFs, which was last approved by the County Council in September 2018, initial assumptions have been made about inflation, pressures, council tax levels and the use of reserves. Total anticipated savings of £80m are required and savings targets were set for departments as part of the planning process for balancing the budget.
51. The proposals in this report represent suggested ways in which departmental savings could be generated to meet the target that has been set as part of the Tt2021 Programme. Individual Executive Members cannot make decisions on strategic issues such as council tax levels and use of reserves and therefore, these proposals, together with the outcomes of the *Serving Hampshire - Balancing the Budget* consultation exercise outlined below, will

DRAFT

go forward to Cabinet and County Council and will be considered in light of all the options that are available to balance the budget by 2021/22.

52. The County Council undertook an open public consultation called *Serving Hampshire – Balancing the Budget* which ran for six weeks from 5 June to the 17 July 2019. The consultation was widely promoted to stakeholders through a range of online and offline channels including: the County Council's website; local media and social media channels; the County Council's residents' e-newsletter *Your Hampshire*; direct mail contact to a wide range of groups and organisations across Hampshire; posters and adverts in County Council libraries, Country Parks, at Hillier Gardens and Calshot Activity Centre; in residential and day care settings, on electronic noticeboards in GP surgeries and healthcare settings. Information Packs and Response Forms were available in hard copy in standard and Easy Read, with other formats available on request. Comments could also be submitted via email, letter or as comments on social media.
53. The consultation sought residents' and stakeholders' views on several options that could contribute towards balancing the revenue budget, and any alternatives not yet considered – as well as the potential impact of these approaches. The consultation was clear that a range of options would be needed to meet the required £80m savings by 2021. For example, the Information Pack illustrated the amount of savings that would still be required even if council tax was increased by up to 10%.
54. The options were:
 - Reducing and changing services;
 - Introducing and increasing charges for some services;
 - Lobbying central government for legislative change;
 - Generating additional income;
 - Using the County Council's reserves;
 - Increasing council tax; and
 - Changing local government arrangements in Hampshire.
55. Information on each of the above approaches was provided in an Information Pack. This set out the limitations of each option, if taken in isolation, to achieving required savings. For example, supporting information explained that the £80m estimated budget shortfall took into account an assumed increase in 'core' council tax of 4.99% in both 2020/21 and 2021/22. The Pack also explained that if central government were to support changing local government arrangements in Hampshire, savings would still take several years to be realised. Residents were similarly made aware that the use of reserves would only provide a temporary fix, providing enough money to run services for around 27 days.
56. Therefore, whilst each option offers a valid way of contributing in-part to balancing the budget – plugging the estimated £80m gap in full will inevitably require a combination of approaches.

DRAFT

57. A total of 5,432 responses were received to the consultation – 4,501 via the Response Forms and 931 as unstructured responses through email, letter and social media.
58. The key findings from consultation feedback are as follows:
- The majority of respondents (52%) agreed that the County Council should continue with its current **financial strategy**. This involves **targeting resources on the most vulnerable** people; **planning ahead** to secure savings early and enable investment in more efficient ways of working; and the **careful use of reserves** to help address funding gaps and plug additional demand pressures e.g. for social care.
 - Achieving the required savings is likely to require a multi-faceted approach. However, respondents would prefer that the County Council seeks to explore all other options before pursuing proposals to reduce and change services – in particular, opportunities to **generate additional income** and **lobby central government for legislative change**.
 - Just over one in three respondents (37%) agreed with the principle of **reducing or changing services** - but the proportion who disagreed was slightly higher (45%) - Of all the options, this was respondents' **least preferred**.
 - Around half of respondents (**52%**) **agreed** with the principle of **introducing and increasing charges** to help cover the costs of running some local services, but over one-third (39%) felt that additional charges should not be applied.
 - Respondents were in favour of **lobbying central government** to allow charging in some areas:
 - 66% agreed with charging for issuing Older Person's Bus Passes.
 - 64% agreed with charging for Home to School Transport.
 - 56% agreed with diverting income from speeding fines or driver awareness courses.
 - However, in other areas, opinions were more mixed:
 - 42% agreed and 43% disagreed with recouping 25% of concessionary fares.
 - most did not feel that it would be appropriate to lobby for charges relating to library membership (60% disagreement) or HWRCs (56% disagreement).
 - Overall, lobbying for legislative change to enable charging was respondents' **second preferred option**.
 - Of all the options presented, generating additional income was the **most preferred option**. Suggestions included:
 - Improving the efficiency of council processes.

DRAFT

- Increasing fees or charges for services.
- Using council assets in different ways.
- Implementing new, or increasing existing, taxes.
- Lobbying central Government for more funding.
- Six out of ten respondents (61%) agreed with the position that **reserves should not be used** to plug the budget gap.
- Most respondents (55%) preferred the County Council to raise **council tax** by less than 4.99%. This compared to 34% of respondents whose first choice was to raise council tax by 4.99%. There was limited support for a rise in council tax above this level (14%).
- More than half of those who responded (**61%**) **agreed** that consideration should be given to **changing local government arrangements in Hampshire**.
- One in three (36%) respondents noted **potential impacts** on poverty (financial impacts), age (mainly older adults and children), disability and rurality.
- Staffing efficiencies were the most common focus of **additional suggestions** (31%).
- The 931 unstructured **other responses** to the consultation primarily focused on ways to reduce workforce costs (26% of comments), the impact of national politics on local government (8%), the need to reduce inefficiency (6%) and both support and opposition to council tax increases (7%).

Proposals following consultation feedback

59. Executive Members and Chief Officers have been provided with the key findings from the consultation to help in their consideration of the final savings proposals. As the consultation feedback confirms, a number of different approaches are likely to still be needed to meet the scale of the financial challenge. Consequently, the County Council will seek to:
- **continue with its financial strategy**, which includes:
 - **targeting resources** on the most vulnerable adults and children
 - **using reserves carefully** to help meet one-off demand pressures
 - **maximise income generation** opportunities;
 - **lobby central government** for legislative change to enable charging for some services;
 - **minimise reductions and changes to local services** wherever possible, including by raising council tax by 4.99%;
 - consider further the opportunities for **changing local government arrangements** in Hampshire.

DRAFT

60. The proposals set out in Appendix 1 have, wherever possible, been developed in line with these principles.
61. With regard to Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) it is proposed to extend the existing policy of recovering the disposal cost of non-household waste from charging to include large wood items such as fence panels, sheds and window frames (see Appendix 1 ETE2). This proposal is recommended ahead of alternatives such as reducing HWRC opening hours and is informed by the responses received from residents who have confirmed a preference for charging over reductions and changes to services.
62. The saving from the Department's Operating Model (see Appendix 1 ETE5) is mainly focussed on increasing net income from either providing traded services to other organisations or increasing the range of services provided where a charge is levied. Generating savings in this way helps protect front line services provided to the public and, again, this is informed by the views expressed in the consultation confirming a preference for generating additional income ahead of reducing or changing local services.
63. A number of specific comments were made regards ETE proposals in the *Serving Hampshire – Balancing the Budget* consultation. In terms of the written comments made in the formal responses, 36 made negative comments about the Highways and Winter Maintenance proposals, and 32 negative comments were made about the Street Lighting proposals. In addition, there were 31 comments on social media regards Highways Services, 17 of which asked for the service to be improved. A Parish Council also commented on the importance of the Parish Lengthsmen in delivering minor highways works, asking for the role to be extended.
64. Following the Executive Member Decision Days, all final savings proposals will go on to be considered by the Cabinet and Full Council in October and November – providing further opportunity for the overall options for balancing the budget to be considered as a whole and in view of the consultation findings. Further to ratification by Cabinet and the full County Council, some proposals may be subject to further, more detailed consultation.
65. In addition to the consultation exercise, Equality Impact Assessments have been produced for all the savings proposals outlined in Appendix 1 and these have been provided for information in Appendix 2. These will be considered further and alongside a cumulative EIA by Cabinet and the full County Council. The cumulative assessment provides an opportunity to consider the multiple impacts across proposals as a whole and, therefore, identify any potential areas of multiple disadvantage where mitigating action(s) may be needed.
66. Together the *Balancing the Budget* consultation and Equality Impact Assessments have helped to shape the final proposals presented for approval in this report.
67. Two proposals are likely to require a phase 2 consultation prior to a decision by the Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment (EMETE). Firstly, any proposal to extend part-night streetlighting and/or dimming, with an EMETE decision likely to take place spring/summer 2020. Secondly, the proposal to charge for non-household wood at HWRCs would require further consultation followed by an EMETE decision in early 2020.

REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:

Links to the Strategic Plan

Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity:	Yes/No
People in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives:	Yes/No
People in Hampshire enjoy a rich and diverse environment:	Yes/No
People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:	Yes/No

Other Significant Links

Links to previous Member decisions:	
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives	
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
Looking Ahead - Medium Term Financial Strategy https://democracy.hants.gov.uk/ielssueDetails.aspx?Id=10915&PlanId=0&Opt=3#A18687	Cabinet - 18 June 2018 County Council – 20 September 2018

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.)	
<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
None	

EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

1. 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.

2. Equalities Impact Assessment:

Equality Impact Assessments have been produced for all the savings proposals outlined in Appendix 1 and these have been provided for information in Appendix 2.

Economy, Transport and Environment – Proposed Savings Options (Subject to consultation where appropriate)

Ref.	Service Area and Description of Proposal	Impact of Proposal	2020/21	2021/22	Full Year Impact	Estimated Staffing Impact FTE
			£'000	£'000	£'000	

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 28</p> <p>ETE1</p>	<p>Waste disposal contract: To make changes to the financial arrangements by removing HCC cost subsidies in the recycling of household waste in Hampshire, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maximise and retain income from the sale of recycled materials by HCC • charge costs currently incurred by HCC to District Councils • end direct subsidy payments to District Councils where recycling infrastructure and facilities have been provided to them free of charge to use • maximise impacts of Waste prevention activities • explore further re-financing options related to the Waste Disposal Contract 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Council partners will be impacted by changing the financial model to remove subsidies which will impact through reduced income / recovery of full costs by HCC. • Service users should see no immediate impact, but in the long term may benefit from potential future countywide harmonisation of waste collection schemes and in the shorter term by a more straight-forward recycling offer and/or an increased range of materials. • No direct impact upon HCC staff is anticipated. 	0	8,200	8,200	0
--	---	---	---	-------	-------	---

ETE2	<p>Waste disposal – HWRCs: To charge customers to deposit wood at Household Waste Recycling Centres (i.e. non-household wood wastes, including fence panels, sheds, window frames etc.).</p> <p>This is in-line with existing policies to charge for other DIY type wastes and will serve to recover costs only.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users seeking to deposit non-household wood wastes will incur additional costs in using HWRC sites. • Veolia as partners will deliver the charging service, but there will be limited impact as required infrastructure is already in place. • There is likely to be increased customer contact from Service users as a result of the introduction of the charge. 	500	1,000	1,000	0

ETE3	Street Lighting: To seek further reductions in the cost of managing Hampshire's streetlighting network , through opportunities offered from advances in technology and/or other service efficiencies including extending dimming and part-night lighting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact upon Service users will be dependent upon the nature of how savings are achieved. Service efficiencies could impact upon network coverage e.g. further part night lighting. • No direct impact on ETE staff is anticipated. 	50	100	500	0
ETE4	Highways: To make modest savings to the existing Highways Service , through alternative funding of the Parish Lengthsman scheme, and/or other Highways contract efficiencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council partners could be asked to provide funding for their Parish Lengthsman. • No direct impact on ETE staff is anticipated. • No impact on service users is anticipated. 	200	300	500	0

ETE5	<p>To build on cross-cutting income/savings already achieved in T19 (£4.85m target), by identifying further opportunities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • generate income through trading activities • generate income through charging for Council services • seek further efficiencies against the department's Operating Model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to Operating Model may impact 15 - 25 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) posts. Savings would be achieved as far as possible through vacancy management and natural turnover within the relevant services although this may not be sufficient to meet the full reduction required and therefore other measures such as voluntary redundancy and redeployment where appropriate would be explored. • Service users may incur new or increased charges to access certain ETE services (these will be for the purpose of cost-recovery). 	100	600	1,548	15 – 25
Totals			850	10,200	11,748	15-25

Appendix 2 – Equalities Impact Assessments

- [ETE1 Waste Disposal Contract](#)
- [ETE2 Waste Disposal: HWRCs](#)
- [ETE3 Street Lighting Efficiencies](#)
- [ETE4 Highways](#)
- [ETE5 Cross Cutting Departmental Savings - Service Users](#)
- [ETE5 Cross-Cutting Departmental Savings - Staff](#)

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Committee:	Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee
Date:	17 September 2019
Title:	Cycling Strategy Update
Report From:	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

Contact name: Frank Baxter

Tel: 01962 846819

Email: frank.baxter2@hants.gov.uk

Purpose of Report

1. To report back to the Committee on key issues raised in October 2018 regarding cycling in Hampshire and recommend next steps.

Contextual Information

2. In October last year, the Economy, Transport, and Environment Select Committee reviewed an update on Hampshire County Council's Cycling Strategy and heard feedback from local cycling advocacy groups on both the strategy, and their views on infrastructure in Hampshire. The Committee agreed to give consideration to this feedback and requested further updates from officers.
3. Key challenges raised by the local cycling advocacy groups are summarised as follows, current positions on each of these issues is set out in the section below:
 - a. That the current Cycle Strategy is not fit for purpose
 - b. Hampshire County Council cycling policy is perceived to be pro-car rather than prioritising walking, cycling and public transport
 - c. The design of cycle routes and schemes is lacking e.g. materials (often surfacing related) and quality (e.g. the overuse of shared use paths over fully segregated cycle facilities)
 - d. Dissatisfaction with the level of engagement in schemes, with a particular focus on s.278 works where the local consultation with cycle groups can be left to a developer to coordinate)
 - e. A call for Hampshire County Council to adopt cycle design standards
4. Subsequently, one of the advocacy groups, Cycle Basingstoke, has been invited to present to Cllr Humby and Cllr Oppenheimer with the attendance of Cllr Reid, Cllr Westbrook and officers, to give more detailed feedback on cycling infrastructure in the Basingstoke area.

Updates on challenges raised at 2018 Committee

a. “That the current cycle strategy is not fit for purpose”:

5. This point was discussed in some depth at the October Committee with reference to the initial aims of the strategy. At the time it was pointed out that the strategy is achieving what it set out to do. The strategy aim is “to develop plans *where HCC resources allow*” and is rooted in the practicalities and realities of available funding opportunities. However, it became apparent that the advocacy groups would like to see a higher ambition for cycling.
6. The advocacy group illustrated their concerns using examples. Most of the issues raised were very local in nature and very detailed. A new, refreshed county wide strategy would be unlikely to be comprehensive or detailed enough to address these concerns. This suggests that rather than review the strategy, it would be better to develop implementation plans for cycling at a local level. The Government are encouraging Local Highway Authorities to develop Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs). There is, at present, no dedicated Government funding for these plans or the measures within them, however, LCWIPs enable the Local Highway Authority, Local Planning Authority and stakeholders to work together to identify walking and cycling networks, rather than isolated schemes, and prioritise delivery of future improvements in an evidence based and collaborative way.
7. Since the scrutiny meeting Hampshire County Council have completed an LCWIP in support of the Clean Air Zone project in Fareham/Gosport and used this plan to secure £464,000 of funding towards cycling infrastructure projects which must be delivered within a very short timescale. The development of this LCWIP and its subsequent funding success emphasises the potential of this approach although in this case it was highly targeted to a known funding opportunity.
8. Borough-wide LCWIPs are under development for both Gosport and Fareham to incorporate areas outside of the Clean Air Zone and to consider projects that could be delivered over a longer time frame.
9. We are currently developing further LCWIPs for Havant, Winchester City, Eastleigh, and the Southampton travel to work areas of Test Valley and New Forest. Most of these have been selected as a priority because of their potential to access a new funding opportunity, the Government’s Transforming Cities Fund to which we intend to submit bids in November 2019.
10. It is also worth considering that, if they are to be effective, LCWIPs should sit within the context of a multimodal transport strategy. This is because of the interconnectedness of all forms of transport and because most modes have to share the same physical space. This, crucially, means making choices about the relative priorities between modes in the local setting. Therefore, developing plans for walking and cycling should ideally be undertaken as part of a programme of area strategy development. Hampshire County Council has traditionally had Area Access Plans to undertake this function, but many of these were started over ten years ago but are being refreshed. With available resources not all of these can be done at the same time. Several area strategies

(Winchester City, Basingstoke Town and Waterside – New Forest) are currently under development and we intend to roll out a programme for the future. Current thinking for prioritising future areas is based on strategic need/case, population, local opportunities and likelihood of significant change in land use. On this basis, it is currently anticipated that Andover, Farnborough, Aldershot, Fleet and Urban South Hampshire would follow next in the current programme.

11. It was evident that Hampshire County Council was not clearly showing what investment in cycling infrastructure was happening. Large sums of funding have been secured for cycling measures as part of major schemes and significant activity is taking place related to cycling training and promotion.
12. In order to better show capital spend on cycling and walking the County Council have begun to report against a new capital sub programme for walking and cycling measures. The table below is an extract from the most recent capital programme report. It highlights known and planned expenditure on such scheme over the next two years. In total for the year 2019-20 spend on cycling and walking infrastructure represents a significant of the total transport capital program.
13. Future years programmes are still in development and are not yet fully formed. However, there is an increasing level activity associated with feasibility works and on LCWIPS and new bidding opportunities which is a positive indicator that future capital programme will include further cycling schemes. A significant proportion of the County Council feasibility resources is currently allocated to six Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPS) in this years programme.

Table showing the walking and cycling sub programme

Walking & Cycling Sub-Programme As at July 2019			
19/20			
1260	Access improvements to Kings School, Winchester	£	300,000
1471	Hook to Dilly Lane Cycle Route	£	445,000
1849	Andover Railway/Environmental Improvements	£	325,000
2153	Romsey Road, Winchester - Clifton Terrace Crossing	£	481,000
2223	Jermyns Lane Footway to Braishfield, Romsey	£	350,000
2246	Andover - Roman Way/Viking Way/Smannell Rd TC	£	300,000
2547	Bishops Waltham Centre Access Imp	£	271,000
2648	Hambledon Road, Waterlooville Toucan crossing & cycling improvements	£	250,000
2650	West End High Street Access Imp	£	250,000
2760	Whitchurch Access & TM	£	388,000
2884	Andover: Access to Town Mills car park and Riverside Improvements	£	1,303,000
3028	Whitehill & Bordon - Budds Lane	£	3,420,000
3050	Fareham: NO ₂ Cycle Infrastructure	£	464,000
20/21			
2213	A340 Safety & Accessibility Imp	£	300,000
2604	Horndean Access Imp	£	450,000
	Total	£	9,297,000

b. Hampshire County Council cycling policy is perceived to be pro-car rather than prioritising walking, cycling and public transport:

14. The October Committee highlighted that the advocacy groups perceive that Hampshire County Council is pro car and may even have an anti-cycling culture. Hampshire County Council seeks to balance its approach to all modes within the framework of the Local Transport Plan. This is increasingly important in the context of the Climate Emergency declared by Hampshire County Council this year. It is somewhat inevitable that there will be divergence on some issues between what advocacy groups would like to see, and what can be achieved whilst maintaining this balance. Accepting and recognising this difference will be important in building a productive relationship in the future. This does not preclude us from reviewing our current practices and the relative balance in light of Hampshire recently declaring a Climate Emergency.
15. As above, Cycle Basingstoke presented to Cllr Humby and others earlier this year, setting out their views on cycling infrastructure in Basingstoke delivered by both Hampshire County Council and developers. Cycle Basingstoke did not attend the scrutiny meeting but wanted to share their examples of where they felt Hampshire County Council was lacking in its cycle culture. They set out a number of issues including widths of paths, directness of routes, quality of materials, use of barriers/bollards etc which we feel can be addressed. On this basis, two events are planned for September to undertake a deep dive into these issues and see how Hampshire can improve its cycle culture. The first will take the form of an officer workshop using the presentation set by Cycle Basingstoke and facilitated by one of the country's leading cycling infrastructure specialists. The aim of the workshop is to identify processes, decision points, stakeholders and standards that have resulted in the issues raised. It will set out a series of suggested improvements for future practice where possible and practicable. These suggestions will be presented to Members and Cycle Basingstoke in a subsequent presentation, for their feedback.
16. If this format is successful, we will seek to hold a larger, County-wide event in Spring 2020.

c. The design of cycle routes and schemes is lacking e.g. materials (often surfacing related) and quality (e.g the overuse of shared use paths over fully segregated cycle facilities):

In practical terms, this point is linked to cycle design standards and is therefore covered in e) below

d. Dissatisfaction with the level of engagement in schemes, with a particular focus on s.278 works where the local consultation with cycle groups can be left to a developer to coordinate):

17. The points raised by the advocacy groups do suggest that there is a need to communicate and work together better so that more open and constructive dialogue and challenge can take place. A cycle champion role was suggested

but this has been tried in other authorities and we should learn from this experience. If, as inferred, there is a culture in Hampshire County Council which means our planners, engineers and designers are really unaware of cycle issues then such an action is likely to alienate rather than support a genuine evolution of culture. In addition, it could easily have the reverse impact with cycle issues becoming one individual's responsibility rather than a systematic shared responsibility.

18. An alternative approach would be to foster a more collaborative dialogue between cycle representatives, planners, designers and engineers. Actions that might support this include:
- Workshopping the concerns raised by the representatives with planners, designers and engineers as part of the County wide event referred to above
 - Reviewing how and when cycle plans and strategies are engaged and consulted on
 - Initiating a process of cycle and pedestrian audit and review for all new highways schemes
 - For all major schemes, undertake an independent cycle assessment by a trained assessor
 - Communicate feasibility findings with cycle representatives so they can see why, in some circumstances, we are unable to deliver more ambitious cycle schemes

e. A call for Hampshire County Council to adopt cycle design standards:

This section also reflects point c) as they are closely linked.

19. Hampshire County Council does not have its own bespoke cycle design standards. This is because a "one size fits all" approach is not considered appropriate for Hampshire's geography or for different road classifications. Moreover, guidance has already been developed by others. Hampshire County Council use the Government's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) for major and strategic roads, Manual for Streets 2 for more local roads, Local Transport Note (LTN) design standards and other highway authority industry standards such as the London and Cardiff Cycle Design Guides, and apply them with professional judgement and skill depending on the local specifics of the scheme, its location and road class hierarchy (i.e. Strategic Road Network, A roads, B Roads, C Roads, Unclassified). For this reason, it is not felt appropriate or necessary to develop Hampshire County Council standards.
20. It may be useful to develop a policy stance in terms of some design principles that are faced on a frequent basis, or are the most contentious. These could be selected and developed with cycle, pedestrian and mobility group representatives as part of a County wide event workshop. They may include:
- use of shared use pedestrian and cycle facilities, instead of segregated on or off-road facilities. These are widely agreed not to be the favoured

solution by cycle and walking representatives, designers and planners. However, they are often the only compromise option available to not having cycle schemes at all, where space is at a premium. Taking a stance against future shared facilities would need to be considered carefully but would be something on which clarity of policy would be beneficial.

- Prioritising active modes. In achieving a balanced distribution of road space, it can be challenging in practice to reallocate highway space towards walking and cycling. It is sometimes the case that pedestrian amenity is reduced in order to ensure that the highway still functions within capacity for motor vehicles. Alternative approaches should be investigated, for example, recognising that most cars carry only one person each, space could be allocated based on its potential to move the most road users.
- End of Route signs. End of Route signs. These are often used to denote where a cycle route leaves a shared path to join/cross the carriageway and can be interpreted by users that the Highway Authority has “given up” on cyclists at this location often where space is at a premium at junctions that are tricky to manoeuvre by bicycle. However, to pedestrians, this signage may be interpreted to assure them that they have priority. End of Route signs are now rarely used in new schemes but the historic proliferation of such signs has left a legacy. Cyclists would like to see them removed and some authorities have already done so.
- Cyclist Dismount signs and tight or narrow barriers. These signs and barriers are often used in subways, no cycling zones such as pedestrianised town centres, or sometimes in place of End of Route signs, or during works on the highway. Again, some authorities have started to replace the signs and use different designs of barriers and bollards to reflect that many disabled people find cycling easier than walking and use bicycles or adapted cycles as mobility aids. In addition, an increasing number of families are opting to travel by cargo bike which are longer and heavier than standard cycles. For some, walking, wheeling or lifting a cycle might be physically impossible. Signs to encourage courteous use of these spaces, and alternative barrier arrangements could be investigated.
- The type of cyclist we design for is important. Designing facilities useable by unaccompanied 12 year olds may require one approach, and designing for confident commuters another, although the ultimate ideal might be to provide segregated direct facilities that can accommodate both. A design considered child safe is often segregated or shared, on footway, leisure focused and in many cases indirect. Such routes may frustrate commuters. Routes should be designed based on key criteria such as: safety, directness, comfort, coherence, attractiveness and adaptability.
- Cycle Parking. As with cyclist dismount signs, many authorities are changing their approach to providing cycle parking to better cater for users of adapted bikes and cargo bikes. As a developer of cycle schemes, Hampshire County

Council could develop a cycle parking policy for its own schemes, and work with Local Planning Authorities to review their own cycle parking standards.

Summary

21. In summary, following the October Committee meeting, the points raised by cycle advocacy groups have been reviewed by officers in detail to identify where things are working well, where improvements can be made, and where an alternative approach may be required.
22. Work is underway on several Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans, the County Council have created a sub program for cycling within the highways capital programme. The County Council has also listened to the feedback from the advocacy groups and is taking steps to explore its current cycle culture and see if this could be improved. This has included a “deep dive” test into one area which is resulting in a specific review of scheme delivery in Basingstoke in September. Provided this format is useful we propose to hold a walking and cycling conference in Spring 2020 to extend the approach to all advocacy groups, and wider user groups and to test a number of design standard principles. A summary of these actions is set out in the table below:

Action	Estimated programme
Continue to develop LCWIPs	6 plus this financial year, future programme to be determined
Cycle Basingstoke workshops	September 2019
Walking and cycling conference (subject to success of Cycle Basingstoke workshops)	Spring 2020
Foster a more collaborative dialogue between cycle representatives, planners, designers and engineers	“How” we do this could be a topic of the Walking and Cycling Conference – Spring 2020
Develop policy stance on key issues	The key policy areas could be identified at the Walking and Cycling Conference – Spring 2020

Appendix 1: General update

General progress update

Fareham - Air Quality exceedance, and LCWIPs

In response to a directive from Government to reduce an air quality exceedance in Fareham (close to Quay Street Roundabout) to within the acceptable limit “in the shortest possible time”, a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) was developed relating to the specific geographic scope for the air quality management area.

The LCWIP used a strong evidence base to identify schemes to encourage a modal shift towards cycling away from private car use. The directive constrained the scope of these schemes to those that could be delivered in 2019.

The package is made up of the following improvements:

- a minor improvement to replace missing tactile paving on an existing shared use path on Heritage Way in Gosport;
- widening an existing cycle bypass lane into the verge at the junction of Foster Road and South Street;
- two elements on Marine Parade in Lee-on-the Solent. The first of these measures is removal and relocation of a low-use bus shelter from an existing shared use path. The second is some minor resurfacing of the former hovercraft slipway to provide a missing link in the existing local cycle path;
- widening an existing footway link between Seamead and Linkway in Fareham, to create a shared use path;
- conversion of an existing Pelican crossing on Burnt House Lane in Fareham to a Toucan crossing;
- widening the existing footway along a stretch of Peak Lane in Fareham to create a shared use path;
- widening the carriageway at Longfield Avenue in Fareham to accommodate a new refuge island; and
- widening an existing crossing refuge island on West Street in Fareham, near to the railway station
- New signage across the full length of the four priority routes.

The total funding achieved from Government for these works was £463,400.

Gosport – Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) extension

The plans for the extension of the BRT have been amended to incorporate the concerns raised by walking and cycling groups. The new enhanced scheme improves on previous design options by retaining Rowner Road bridge and the segregation of walkers and cyclists from the busy traffic at the Rowner Road junction.

East Hampshire - Green Grid Green Loop

The Green Grid Green Loop (GGGL) aims to provide a comprehensive network of walking and cycling connections between the existing and new town development and a range of schools, sports and recreational facilities and natural green spaces. Additional funding has been awarded by the EM3 LEP, bringing the total bid funding to over £5m. A further bid has been submitted to EHDC's s106 fund. Budds Lane is the largest section of the GGGL and is expected to be complete on site by October 2019.

The Town Council in Petersfield are seeking the support of Hampshire County Council to co-develop plans for improvements in Petersfield. The aim of the Town Council is to make walking and cycling into town a better option. Funding for a future scheme is currently expected to come from multiple local sources and the County Councils market towns initiative.

Farnborough - Lynchford Road

The Lynchford Road Major Scheme is being designed to incorporate a segregated cycle route, which will be a considerable improvement over the existing shared use footway provision. Subject to detail design, the intention is to incorporate appropriate priority over side road crossings, consistent with best practice elsewhere in the UK and on the continent.

Basingstoke - Brighton Hill

Brighton Hill Roundabout is subject to a major scheme which has been successful in securing funding. It is a key junction along the A30 SW Corridor, for which there is an aspiration to provide a strategic cycle route. The improvements at Brighton Hill Roundabout incorporate proposals that would form part of this strategic route as well as providing connecting links to nearby residential areas. The designs are being developed using the latest guidance in Interim Advice Note 195/16 and the London Cycle Design Standards.

Subject to prioritization within future studies budgets it is anticipated that further feasibility work will be undertaken to develop proposals for a strategic cycle route along the A30 SW Corridor.

Southampton Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) Tranche 1 – Hut Hill and Totton in New Forest and Eastleigh

In collaboration with Southampton City Council, Hampshire County Council was successful in securing funding for delivery of cycle scheme for Hut Hill in Eastleigh and Totton going into the Waterside in the New Forest. The scheme have moved into a delivery phase.

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Report

Committee:	Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee
Date:	17 September 2019
Title:	Work Programme
Report From:	Director of Transformation & Governance – Corporate Services

Contact name: Katy Sherwood, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: 01962 847347

Email: katy.sherwood@hants.gov.uk

1. Summary

1.1. The purpose of this item is to provide the work programme of future topics to be considered by this Select Committee.

2. Recommendation

That the Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee approve the attached work programme.

CORPORATE OR 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:	no
People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:	no

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.)

DocumentLocation

None

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equality Duty

- 1.1. 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 under the Act;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

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

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

1.2. Equalities Impact Assessment:

- 1.3. This is a forward plan of topics under consideration by the Select Committee, therefore this section is not applicable to this report. The Committee will request appropriate impact assessments to be undertaken should this be relevant for any topic that the Committee is reviewing.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

- 2.1. This is a forward plan of topics under consideration by the Select Committee, therefore this section is not applicable to this report. The Committee will request appropriate impact assessments to be undertaken should this be relevant for any topic that the Committee is reviewing.

3. Climate Change:

- a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?
- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

This is a forward plan of topics under consideration by the Select Committee, therefore this section is not applicable to this report. The Committee will consider climate change when approaching topics that impact upon our carbon footprint / energy consumption.

WORK PROGRAMME – ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT SELECT COMMITTEE

Topic	Issue	Reason for inclusion	Status and Outcomes	17 September 2019	14 January 2020	21 April 2020	June 2020
Pre-scrutiny	ETE Dept Capital and Revenue budgets	Pre-scrutiny of department budget prior to Executive Member sign-off	Select Committee's pre-scrutinise the budget proposals annually in January. In 2019 there is also due to be pre-scrutiny at the September meeting of Transformation to 2021 savings plans.	✓			
Information Item	HCC Countryside Service Pollinator pilot project (Steve Peach)	Request of the Chairman			✓		
Information Item	Recycled products market (James Potter + Veolia)	Requested by Committee in June 2019			✓		
Information Item	Highways England Update	Requested by Committee in June 2019					
For future review	Cycling Strategy (Strategy approved in 2016)	Progress update requested by Cllr Tod June 2017	Update following a cycling working lunch in January 2019. Frank Baxter is the officer lead.	✓			

Topic	Issue	Reason for inclusion	Status and Outcomes	17 September 2019	14 January 2020	21 April 2020	June 2020
For future review	Air Quality	Requested following a presentation at the April 2019 meeting by James Moore	To review and receive updates following discussions at the April 2019 meeting.		✓		
For future review	Climate Change Action Plan	Request of the Chairman following discussion at Cabinet		✓			
For future review	Street Light Safety	Requested by Cllr Tod	Following concerns over safety in areas where street lights have been turned off, the Select Committee have agreed to review the crime statistics for areas of perceived risk to see whether there are any patterns or increase.				✓
For future review	Fly-Tipping Update	Annual update to Committee by Gareth Roberts	To monitor progress and work being done by the Fly-tipping team across Hampshire.				✓

Suggestions to be added when timely:

- Review of Walking Strategy brought in in 2016 (request by Cllr Tod June 2017)
- Impact of Brexit on the Hampshire Economy (request by Cllr Kyrle June 2017)
- Invite bus companies to a meeting to explain their perspective and hear the member perspective (request by Cllr Philpott Oct 2018)

This page is intentionally left blank