

**1. Topic of assessment**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>EIA title:</b> | Proposed changes to Surrey's Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) |
|-------------------|---|

|                    |                                      |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>EIA author:</b> | Nicholas Meadows – Change Consultant |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|

**2. Approval**

|                                | <b>Name</b>       | <b>Date approved</b> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Approved by<sup>1</sup></b> | Richard Parkinson | 23/08/17             |

**3. Quality control**

|                        |          |                      |          |
|------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| <b>Version number</b>  | V1       | <b>EIA completed</b> | 23/08/17 |
| <b>Date Last saved</b> | 13/09/17 | <b>EIA published</b> | 15/09/17 |

**4. EIA team**

| <b>Name</b>       | <b>Job title<br/>(if applicable)</b> | <b>Organisation</b>   | <b>Role</b>                               |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Nicholas Meadows  | Change Consultant                    | Surrey County Council | Author                                    |
| Steve Strickland  | Waste Contract Manager               | Surrey County Council | Reviewer                                  |
| Richard Parkinson | Waste Operations Group Manager       | Surrey County Council | Approver                                  |
| Jay Ganesh        | Senior Programme Officer             | Surrey County Council | Directorate Equality Group Representative |

<sup>1</sup> Refer to earlier guidance for details on getting approval for your EIA.

## 5. Explaining the matter being assessed

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</b></p> | <p>The council provides 15 community recycling centres (CRCs) where 113,285 tonnes of waste and recycling were taken by Surrey residents in 2016/17. Over the past few years our contractor, Suez Surrey, who manage the sites have undertaken a programme of redevelopment at a number of our community recycling centres. Nine of the sites in the network are now modern split-level sites, where heavy goods vehicles and the public are separated, and stepped access to containers has been replaced by a vehicle ramp. This has greatly improved the access to and the capacity of the sites concerned. Unfortunately because of space constraints, it has not been possible to improve all of the sites, and six of the CRCs remain as single level sites where containers are accessed via steps and the sites have to be temporarily closed to the public whilst containers are exchanged or compacted.</p> <p>In 2014/15, SCC identified a number of efficiency measures in the operation of CRCs in Surrey. These measures were finalised following a public consultation that was conducted from 15 July to 30 September 2015 in which 4,581 people responded to give their views. The council's Cabinet on 24 November 2015 agreed to a number of efficiency measures at CRCs, but decided to retain all 15 CRCs in Surrey and allow residents to deposit small amounts of inert building material and plasterboard free of charge.</p> <p>Following the Cabinet decision, the waste service during 2016/17 introduced changes to opening days and hours CRCs, opened reuse shops at larger CRC sites, introduced charges for larger amounts of non-household waste and launched a revised van permit scheme. These changes in a full year are expected to generate £1.4m in cost reductions to SCC.</p> <p>However in light of the councils financial situation, further changes to the CRC service are required to deliver further cost reductions.</p> |
| <p><b>What proposals are you assessing?</b></p>                                 | <p>Noting the consultation that has already taken place on proposed changes to the CRC service and the decisions of Cabinet on 24 November 2015, legal advice recommended that a much shorter consultation of six weeks could be held. With this in mind, SCC sought the views of residents and stakeholders via a consultation that ran from <b>Friday 23 June to Monday 7 August 2017</b>. Consultation respondents were asked for their views on the following five proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal one: Ending the free daily allowance of non-household waste.</li> <li>• Proposal two: Closing CRCs on two weekdays.</li> <li>• Proposal three: Ensuring CRCs are only used by Surrey residents.</li> <li>• Proposal four: Permanent closure of four smaller CRCs (Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham)</li> <li>• Proposal five: Restricting users of vans, trailers and pick-ups to larger sites only.</li> </ul> <p>In light of the response to the public consultation the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning is recommending to Cabinet that the following changes at CRCs are implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CRCs at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham remain open, but are closed for part of the week.</li> </ol>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. A strategic network of CRCs will remain open for seven days a week, other sites will be closed for up to two weekdays.</li> <li>3. The free daily allowance of chargeable waste from the construction, alteration or repair of homes and gardens such as rubble, plasterboard and soil is ceased.</li> <li>4. Vans and trailers are excluded from CRCs at Bagshot, Caterham, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham and Warlingham.</li> <li>5. Non-Surrey residents are excluded from Camberley, and that the Strategic Director, Environment &amp; Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agrees any further restrictions on non-Surrey residents using the Farnham site following further discussions with Hampshire County Council</li> </ol> |
| <b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b> | <p>The above recommendation will affect –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All service users</li> <li>• All service staff</li> </ul>  |

## 6. Sources of information

| <b>Engagement carried out</b>  |
|--|
| <p><b>2014</b></p> <p>A CRC site user survey of behaviours and attitudes was completed during 2014. Residents were asked about gender, work status and house type but the survey did not seek to identify whether any residents had protected characteristics. A total of 3440 online interviews were achieved using a combination of recruitment techniques (cold mailing to 30k Surrey residents, cards handed out to users at all 15 sites, plus an e-mail invitation to the Surrey Matters database).</p> <p><b>2015</b></p> <p>A public consultation ran from 17th July until 30th September regarding potential changes to the CRC service. One of the proposals was to charge for non-household waste. 4581 responses were received. The results of the consultation indicated that of all the service reduction options, reducing opening hours was the most palatable and generally acceptable to residents.</p> <p><b>2017</b></p> <p>A public and staff consultation on the proposed changes listed in section 5 above was held from 23 June to 7 August 2017.</p> <p>The consultation received a total of 13,637 responses including 13,573 from residents and 64 responses from organisations/groups such as district/borough and parish/town Councils. This is considered to be one of the largest ever responses SCC has received to any consultation.</p> <p>The results of this consultation have informed the final recommendations for change, as set out in section 5 above, and the completion of this EIA.</p> |
| <b>Data used</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrey-i, our local data and information portal, which can be searched by protected characteristics.</li> <li>• Feedback to the postcode surveys, consultation questionnaires and customer satisfaction surveys.</li> <li>• Feedback from the contractor and complaints submitted to the SCC contact centre.</li> <li>• Benchmark of other local authorities that have made changes to their Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) services.</li> <li>• Traffic count data, driving time catchments and waste tonnage information.</li> </ul>   |

## 7. Impact of the new/amended policy, service or function

Council officers have developed the recommendations for change alongside this assessment to understand the impact on service users (residents) and staff. In some cases service users or staff may have to drive further to an alternative site as a result of a reduction in operating days. The council will try to limit this by where possible ensuring a nearby alternative site is opened when a site is closed, and it will encourage residents to make their journey when a their preferred CRC site is open, and will mention this in the communications programme that will follow. However this has no differential impact on those service users or staff with protected characteristics, as to be able to drive you need to demonstrate that you're are in good health and that any condition doesn't affect your ability to drive irrespective of the distance driven.

The recommendation to have no free allowance of charging scheme waste may disadvantage residents on a low income, but this is not directly related to those with protected characteristics. It could be considered that those with the protected characteristics of age, disability, pregnancy/maternity and carers might be more likely to have a lower income. However the charging scheme only relates to certain non-household waste materials, which are linked to the alteration, renovation or repair of a home or garden. This means a resident would need the required funds in the first place to carry out the works.

The recommendation to reduce opening days at CRC sites could possibly result in a few staff redundancies. However this will be subject to competitive process, and therefore there will be no differential impact on staff with protected characteristics.

Any potential impacts on the recommended changes have been listed below in sections 7a and 7b.

## 7a. Impact of the proposals on residents and service users with protected characteristics

| Protected characteristic <sup>2</sup> | Potential positive impacts | Potential negative impacts  | Evidence   |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Age</b>                            | None                       | Low – use of the single level sites, where residents need to climb steps to access waste containers could impact those with limited physical ability as they might find it more difficult to dispose of their waste at these sites. Despite this being mitigated by the assistance provided by onsite staff, these sites may become busier as a result of reducing the days of operations, which could have an impact on the assistance that staff are able to provide those with limited mobility. | Anecdotal evidence – project team/contractor                                 |
| <b>Disability</b>                     | None                       | Low – use of the single level sites, where residents need to climb steps to access waste containers could impact those with limited physical ability as they might find it more difficult to dispose of their waste at these sites. Despite this being mitigated by the assistance provided by onsite staff, these sites may become busier as a result of reducing the days of operations, which could have an impact on the assistance that staff are able to provide those with limited mobility. | Anecdotal evidence – project team/contractor                                 |
| <b>Gender reassignment</b>            | None                       | None  | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>        | None                       | Low – use of the single level sites, where residents need to climb steps to access waste containers could impact those with limited physical ability as they might find it more difficult to dispose of their waste at these sites. Despite this being mitigated by the assistance provided by onsite staff,  | Anecdotal evidence – project team/contractor                                 |

<sup>2</sup> More information on the definitions of these groups can be found [here](#).

|  |      |  |  |
|--|------|--|--|
|  |      | these sites may become busier as a result of reducing the days of operations, which could have an impact on the assistance that staff are able to provide those with limited mobility. |  |
| <b>Race</b>                            | None | None   | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Religion and belief</b>             | None | None   | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Sex</b>                             | None | None   | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>              | None | None   | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b> | None | None   | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Carers<sup>3</sup></b>              | None | None   | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |

---

<sup>3</sup> Carers are not a protected characteristic under the Public Sector Equality Duty, however we need to consider the potential impact on this group to ensure that there is no associative discrimination (i.e. discrimination against them because they are associated with people with protected characteristics). The definition of carers developed by Carers UK is that 'carers look after family, partners or friends in need of help because they are ill, frail or have a disability. The care they provide is unpaid. This includes adults looking after other adults, parent carers looking after disabled children and young carers under 18 years of age.'

## 7b. Impact of the proposals on staff with protected characteristics

| Protected characteristic               | Potential positive impacts | Potential negative impacts | Evidence   |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Age</b>                             | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Disability</b>                      | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Gender reassignment</b>             | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>         | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Race</b>                            | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Religion and belief</b>             | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Sex</b>                             | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>              | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b> | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |
| <b>Carers</b>                          | None                       | None                       | Screening- There is no differential impact on this protected characteristic. |

## 8. Amendments to the proposals

| Change | Reason for change |
|--------|-------------------|
| None   | N/a               |

## 9. Action plan

| Potential impact (positive or negative)   | Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact                                  | By when       | Owner             |
|---|--|---------------|-------------------|
| Negative - Some of the smaller CRCs which are single level sites may become busier as a result of reducing the days of operations, which could have an impact on the assistance that staff are able to provide those with limited mobility. | Ensure site staff are given guidance to prioritise users with limited mobility if a site becomes busy. | December 2017 | Richard Parkinson |

## 10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

| Potential negative impact | Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected |
|---------------------------|--|
| None                      | n/a  |

## 11. Summary of key impacts and actions

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</b>                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surrey-i, our local data and information portal, which can be searched by protected characteristics.</li> <li>Feedback to the postcode surveys, consultation questionnaires and customer satisfaction surveys.</li> <li>Feedback from the contractor and complaints submitted to the SCC contact centre.</li> <li>Benchmark of other local authorities that have made changes to their Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) services.</li> <li>Traffic count data, driving time catchments and waste tonnage information.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</b> | Low impact on Age, Disability and Pregnancy/Maternity - use of the single level sites, where residents need to climb steps to access waste containers could impact those with limited physical ability as they might find it more difficult to dispose of their waste at these sites. Despite this being mitigated by the assistance provided by onsite staff, these sites may become busier as a result of reducing the days of operations, which could have an impact on the assistance that staff are able to provide those with limited mobility.                          |



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</b>               | None   |
| <b>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</b> | Ensure site staff are given guidance to prioritise users with limited mobility if a site becomes busy. |
| <b>Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated</b>                        | None   |

This page is intentionally left blank