

APPENDIX 3 - COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Directorate / Service Area		Officer undertaking the assessment
Economy, Transport & Environment		Name: Tom Blackburne-Maze Job Title: Head of Assets and Commissioning Contact details: 01223 699772
Service / Document / Function being assessed		
Household Recycling Service Strategy		
Business Plan Proposal Number (if relevant)	B/R.6.129	
Aims and Objectives of Service / Document / Function		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider options that will deliver a more efficient service whilst achieving £440,000 annual savings in 2014/15; Work with Members and key partners to consider their views and needs in the development of options in the delivery of the service; To review the efficiency and effectiveness of existing household recycling centres (HRCs) within Cambridgeshire; To look at income options such as charging for trade waste at HRCs; Consider alternative ways of delivering the service such as by HRCs being managed by Third Sector companies. 		
What is changing?		
<p>The options being considered will seek to provide annual savings of £440,000 from April 2015 as identified within the Business Plan (ref B/R.6.129). The precise changes will depend on the options approved by Members. However, the potential changes likely to be considered are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A re-design of the service to take into account the best value to the 'public purse' with Business Plan savings of £440,000 in 2015/16; Potential to accept trade wastes at HRCs at a cost; Initiatives to maximise re-use; Service management by Third Sector businesses; Changes to operating regimes e.g. opening hours and charging; Potential closure of up to 3 HRCs; Potential to change HRCs to community facilities at a charge to residents; Changes to HRCs to upgrade experience e.g. split-level facilities, which could result in fewer facilities across the County. 		
Who is involved in this impact assessment?		
e.g. Council officers, partners, service users and community representatives.		
<p>Project Team</p> <p>Emma Fitch; Jonathan Pearson; Don Haymes; Michael Richards.</p> <p>Programme Board</p> <p>Tom Blackburne-Maze; Emma Fitch; Jonathan Pearson; Don Haymes; Tony Taylorson; Nigel McCurdy; Maggie Pratt.</p>		

Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee Members

1. Cllr R Butcher;
2. Cllr D Connor;
3. Cllr S Criswell;
4. Cllr S Frost;
5. Cllr R Hickford (Chairman);
6. Cllr B Hunt;
7. Cllr J Palmer;
8. Cllr M Rouse;
9. Cllr M Mason;
10. Cllr N Kavanagh;
11. Cllr A Walsh;
12. Cllr B Ashwood;
13. Cllr A Taylor;
14. Cllr S Van De Ven;
15. Cllr G Gillick;
16. Cllr P Reeve (Vice-Chairman);
17. Cllr M Tew.

Stakeholders

RECAP Board members;
RECAP Officers;
AmeyCespa;
District and City Councils;
Neighbouring Authorities;
DEFRA;
County and District members;
Parish Councils;
HRC service users;
Internal colleagues in planning; supporting businesses and communities; infrastructure and S106; growth and development.

What will the impact be?

Tick to indicate if the impact on each of the following protected characteristics is positive, neutral or negative.

Impact	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Age		X	
Disability		X	
Gender reassignment		X	
Marriage and civil partnership		X	
Pregnancy and maternity		X	
Race		X	

Impact	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Religion or belief		X	
Sex		X	
Sexual orientation		X	
The following additional characteristics can be significant in areas of Cambridgeshire.			
Rural isolation			X
Deprivation			X

For each of the above characteristics where there is a positive, negative and / or neutral impact, please provide details, including evidence for this view. Describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts and how the actions are to be recorded and monitored. Describe any issues that may need to be addressed or opportunities that may arise.

Positive Impact
<p>General comment</p> <p>Although no specific impacts have been identified as 'positive' at this stage there are certain options such as split level facilities that would change the assessed 'neutral' impact to a more positive result. However, until the options have been finalised the current case scenarios have been used in relation to this assessment.</p>
Negative Impact
<p>Rural Isolation and Deprivation</p> <p>The potential closure of HRCs in more rural locations such as Fenland has the potential to impact on a large number of people, including the more vulnerable that do not have the ability or opportunity to travel to access services. Any charging mechanisms for such services are also likely to have an impact on the more deprived areas of Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>The closure of HRC sites would also impact on communities that would have further to travel to reach a HRC resulting in those communities incurring more transport costs.</p>
Neutral Impact
<p>The protected characteristics shown in neutral are not, in themselves, determining factors about whether an individual needs to use the household recycling service.</p> <p>Therefore the Household Recycling Service Strategy options are estimated as having a neutral impact on the following characteristics:</p> <p>Age, disability, gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation.</p>
Issues or Opportunities that may need to be addressed
<p>Issues</p> <p>The following issues need to be raised for Members to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How any potential service redesign will impact on the Cambridgeshire communities, working in partnership with City and District Councils; • The impacts any changes will have on the RECAP partners, including potential risks such as fly-tipping; • Potential reputational risks to the County Council; • How to take account of social deprivation when reviewing the service as one size is unlikely to fit all. <p>Opportunities</p> <p>The following opportunities may arise depending on the chosen options approved by Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrades to HRCs to make it easier for the elderly and less able within the community to use the facilities e.g. split-level sites that do not require the need to climb up steps outside; • Key stakeholder and member involvement to help shape the options for the future household recycling service; • Location of sites on public transport routes; • To provide an efficient and effective service taking into account the best value to the 'public purse'.

Community Cohesion

Not considered relevant in relation to the options associated with the delivery of the household recycling service.