

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Community Safety Work and HRA		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
			x		
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£64,000	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£20,000	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£6,000	x		
The Issue					
<p>A significant proportion of the Council's Community Safety Teams' work and particularly Anti- Social Behaviour, involves Council Housing Tenants. The Community Safety Manager has therefore undertaken a recent review of the percentage level of work undertaken on behalf of Housing Tenants and it is estimated that this is currently amounts to the following:</p> <p>Anti- Social Behaviour Officers - Approx.70% of work = £45,300 pa.(confirmed review) Community Safety Officer – Approx. 50% of work = £18,875 pa. (estimate) Community Safety Manager – Approx. 30% of work = £16,500 pa. (estimate) Assistant Director Community Services and Safety – Approx. 5% of work = £3,400 pa (estimate)</p>					
The Proposal					
<p>As much of the Community Safety Teams' work is undertaken on behalf of Housing, in respect of Council tenants, it is proposed that this work should be paid from the Housing Revenue Account. This work includes, but is not limited to, Anti-social behaviour, Domestic Abuse/Violence & Sanctuary schemes and current Domestic Homicide Review. This proposal therefore meets with relevant legislation regarding legitimate HRA expenditure.</p>					
Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)					
<p>The impact of this proposal will fall on the HRA Budget and will result in other work not being undertaken.</p>					
Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income					
<p>None</p>					
Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications					
<p>As stated above, the amount of time that the Council's Anti-Social behaviour Officers spend on Housing work, has been closely monitored over the last few months. The remaining figures for other officers are currently estimates. It is therefore suggested, that these officers should implement a monitoring process to assess 'actual' work undertaken that relates to Housing tenants.</p>					
Responsible Officer	Julie Chandler – Asst. Director Community Services & Safety		Director	Alan Hall, Director of Communities	

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Review of Councillors		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
			x		
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£0	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£0	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£50,000 (notional)			x

The Issue

It has been suggested that a review of Councillors could be undertaken in the future with a view to achieving savings of approximately £50,000 per annum from a date after 2017.

The Proposal

The review as understood by Officers is to seek a reduction in the cost of Councillors of £50,000 per annum. The current budgets for members allowances stands at £311,000. This budgets covers Basic Allowances, SRA's, Travel expenses and pension fund costs.

To save £50,000 per annum would need to see a reduction in the number of Councillors from 58 to 43 or less.

To achieve such a reduction an Electoral Review would be required by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. The last such review in 2002 resulted in a case being made for the reduction of Councillor from 59 to 58.

Such reviews are normally triggered by significant changes in population caused by major housing developments, replacement of multi member wards to single member wards or requests by local authorities to operate with a different number of members. Reviews aim to ensure better electoral representation which reflect local community identities and interests rather than a purely cost saving argument.

Part of the process would be an examination of whether current (or effective) decision making structures could be supported by less members.

From guidance issued by the Boundary Commission, once the request during the preliminary period has been made by this authority the process is estimated at just over 18 months and would be followed by a whole Council election.

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

Making an initial proposal to the boundary commission would require some resources and during the process the proposals would be subjected to external consultation to establish the public and political groups views on the proposals.

The contrast between the rural and urban areas may prove to pose a challenge to achieve electorate equality in say a single member ward proposal.

Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

Undertaking such a review would require resources to be applied to the ensuring the best possible case could be made to the Boundary Commission. There would be a need to hold all ward elections during a year where this was possible legally. If commenced during 2017 the proposals may be agreed in early 2019. Such an all-out election couldn't be held at the same time as a General Election in 2020.

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

Potentially members could look at how SRA's are allocated and/or expenses claimed. Basic allowances make up just over £200,000 of the current budget. The Council could choose to look again at its electoral cycle. This is currently the case in Brentwood as an example. Or a combination of methods above.

Responsible Officer

Simon Hill, Assistant Director of
Governance and Performance
Management

Director

Colleen O'Boyle
Director of Governance

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	The Forester Magazine		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£44,000	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£0	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£0	x		
The Issue					
<p>Ceasing publication of the Forester Magazine with effect from April 2015.</p>					
The Proposal					
<p>It is proposed that with effect from April 2015, the Council should no longer produce and distribute its Forester magazine. More emphasis would be placed on either targeted communications on an issue by issue basis or via other media methods, either press release or online media applications.</p> <p>In recent years the number of the magazines has dropped to three issues per annum. It carries only part copy provided by the Council together with advertisements to offset the costs of each issue.</p> <p>There have been reported problems with distribution in the rural areas and the current Local Government Minister has recently sought to limit the number of occasions that authorities can publish such magazines.</p>					
Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)					
<p>None. A Phase II restructuring proposal is being implemented in the Public Relations and Marketing Section which changes the emphasis of the Council's media efforts to newer online and targeted communications.</p>					
Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income					
None					
Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications					
None					
Responsible Officer	Simon Hill, Assistant Director of Governance and Performance Management		Director	Colleen O'Boyle Director of Governance	

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Review of discretionary Business Rate relief		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
				£15,000	
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£0	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£15,000	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£0			x
The Issue					
<p>The Council issues discretionary rate relief to certain organisations namely certain charities, non-profit making organisations and some rural businesses. Each of these has certain criteria that they must meet. The Council meets 40% of the cost which totals £36,000. The certain charities that receive the relief receive 80% mandatory relief have this topped-up with 20% discretionary relief so that no rates are payable. The main recipients of this are St Clare's Hospice and local cubs and scouts groups and equates to around £6,000. Discretionary relief is also paid to local non-profit making organisations, mainly sports clubs, who receive 80% relief. This relief is capped at a rateable value of £9,000 rateable value so the support provided to larger clubs is limited. The cost of relief in this category is around £24,000. Some rural businesses, such as village shops and pubs meeting criteria, receive 80% discretionary relief. The cost of this relief is around £6,000.</p>					
The Proposal					
<p>The Council could remove, vary the level of relief provided or amend its policy to further restrict who receives the relief. The maximum saving that could be achieved is unlikely to exceed £15,000. Regulations require a year's notice to reduce the level of relief so any change would require notice to be provided with their 2015/16 bills.</p>					
Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)					
<p>The removal of some of the cases may be more sensitive than others, such as with St Clare's Hospice, or with local cubs and scouts groups who only receive on average £200 each. In addition, there is the potential for these scout groups and smaller sports clubs to instead receive Small Business Rate Relief, of which the Council would similarly fund 40%. Therefore the total saving would likely not be £36,000 and may not exceed half of that amount. The relief for sports clubs is designed to support the provision of leisure activity within the district and therefore has a role in the Council's duties with regard to community well-being.</p>					
Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income					
None					
Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications					
<p>There is the potential to vary the policy to a criteria determined by the Council and within the principles of what discretionary relief is designed for. There is the overlap with some of the organisations receiving a separate grant from the Council and the relationship between these and rate relief is being explored as part of the review by Overview and Scrutiny.</p>					
Responsible Officer	Rob Pavey, Assistant Director Revenues		Director	Bob Palmer, Director of Resources	

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Increase in Fees and Charges		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
					x
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£17,000	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£0	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£0		x	

The Issue

Raise additional income from Fees and Charges to help Balance the budget in 2015/16. Scope is somewhat limited however any increases are a step in the right direction.

The Proposal

Additional income from Communities for Arts ,Museum and Sports development	£5,000
Additional lettings at limes farm hall	£5,000
General Fund net increases to Fees and charges	£7,000
Increases to document copying charges (included on Development Control Business case)	-

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

Possibility that users of the services might be put off and income go down particularly the additional £7,000 on General fund

Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

Existing staffing

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

There are a number of other scenarios around larger increases, introducing new charges but this could drive people away and have the opposite effect of that intended.

Responsible Officer	Peter Maddock, Assistant Director Accountancy	Director	Bob Palmer, Director of Resources
----------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Development Management Income & Savings		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
				X	X
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£149,500	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£0	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£0		X	

The Issue

Analysis of a net income/savings for Development Management expenditure to identify savings and additional income streams for the 2015/16 financial year. The savings are based on actual costs that would be incurred should these measures not be taken and the income is based on historical income for 2013/14 and six months of 2014/15.

The Proposal

SAVINGS - The following savings have been identified in consultation with finance

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| (a) Reduce the costs of Planning Applications in local Newspapers
(due to statutory requirements this cannot be completely eliminated) | £ 3 000 |
| (b) End On-Line Planning Law annual subscription
(Legal also have access to a similar facility) | £ 1 500 |
| (c) Reduction in costs of circulating paper copies of plans/documentation to
Parish/Town Councils & replace this with electronic means of communication along with
increased use of e-mails as opposed to letters | £ 20 000 |

SAVINGS SUB – TOTAL **£24 500**

INCOME – the following additional income is expected in 2015/16

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| (d) Pre – Application service (2013/14 £74 000 & 2014/15 £43 000 for 6 months)
+ extend charging regime to include householder advice (£40 a time) = £10 000 | £40 000 |
| (e) Additional Planning Income
this is based excess of income over budget 2013/14 £80 000 & excess over budget
of £108 000 - six months of 2014/15 | £80 000 |
| (f) Document charging for both Development & Building Control based in charging
for the provision of paper copies of planning and building control information | £ 5 000 |
| (g) Proceeds of Crime Act (Enforcement) | £ ? |

ADDITIONAL INCOME SUB – TOTAL **£125 000**

TOTAL NET SAVINGS AND ADDITIONAL INCOME FOR 2015/16 **£149 500**

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

The proposals should improve access to all groups including those who are the most vulnerable as we propose to improve both the quality & distribution of services by focusing on electronic records improvement and access. In addition the efficiency savings for document costs will be mainly focused on the provision of copy building control information in line with the principles of fee earning Building Control operations.

Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

Restructuring of Development Management, seen by Management Board, including a 3 year fixed term Technical Officer Application Systems Officer, funded separately from Development Control income as a one-off cost. This links in with the movement from paper based to electronic based planning/building control services.

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

There are longer term savings that will result from moving to paperless planning and supporting mobile/flexible working that will enable a reduction in floor occupancy and other associated support costs. There are also expected to be further reductions in the cost of provision of service through benchmarking of services and possible future partnership working particularly for Building Control. Finally, savings potential for 2016-17, if planning reception was relocated to be part of the main reception.

Responsible Officer	Nigel Richardson, Assistant Director Development Management	Director	Colleen O'Boyle, Director of Governance
----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------------

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Improving Cost Recovery – Charging Parish Councils	Saving or Income ? (“X”)	Saving	Income
				x

First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£0	Sensitivity of Proposal (“X”)		
	2016/17	£0	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£0		x	

The Issue

A number of Directorates provide assistance to County, Town and Parish Councils at no cost. This work can range from a telephone call, to copying entire files, researching land ownership and attending site meetings. This work ties up officer’s time in providing a service to another authority and does not directly benefit this authority.

There are services such as Human Resources who already charge when they undertake work for Parishes.

The Proposal

1. To impose a charge for any information provided or assistance given to County, Parish or Town Councils.

This proposal does not apply to any partnership working with these Councils nor is it intended that any charges should be levied in respect of short telephone calls or information that can be provided quickly to these Councils.

Officers should be required to negotiate recharge costs for their services. The amounts charged by each Directorate would be small but the numbers of requests for assistance received by the District Council are small in number.

2. To offer Parish and Town Councils the opportunity to buy into an annual EFDC enforcement service in respect of Gypsies and Travellers. This service would comprise:
 - An initial visit
 - And assessment taking into account the code
 - Liaison with the police
 - Updates to public,
 - Legal work, and
 - Follow up with court.

If the second proposal is taken up by any Parishes then other Directorates could look at similar opportunities to have service level agreements or partnership working with Parishes and Town Councils.

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

The introduction of charging may lead to the loss of a free resource for the Town and Parish Councils. Balanced against this is that the amount of work being undertaken is relatively small.

Charging for the service in an ad hoc manner may result in a loss of good will. To offer a service at a fixed fee such as that proposed for the Gypsy and Travellers would be a constructive way of assisting Parishes.

Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

It is proposed to charge for work that is already being carried out. There is an opportunity to increase the work which may require additional staff which should be self-funding.

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

None

Responsible Officer

Alison Mitchell, Assistant
Director Legal Services

Director

Colleen O'Boyle, Director of
Governance

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	New hangar at North Weald		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
					X
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£0	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£0	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£200,000		X	

The Issue

Following market information relating to Hangar 5 at the Airfield it is suggested the Council could build and let a similar hangar to generate income.

The Proposal

To build and let a similar hangar to generate income.

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

The premise is initially attractive and development on the Airfield is to be encouraged – but in the right areas and timed so as not to compromise other aspirations.

Progress with the local plan and the recent decision to explore aviation through a managing partner suggests that simply building hangars for short term income may not be the best way to maximise the asset.

Hence the income is listed for future years as part as a holistic approach to the Airfield and surrounding area.

Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

The approach referred to requires input from staff across directorates and external partners.

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

It is suggested –not as an alternative but as a broader approach- that there would be greater income potential if a planned approach to development is taken.

Responsible Officer	Chris Pasterfield, Assistant Director Asset Management & Economic Development	Director	Colleen O'Boyle, Director of Governance
----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------------

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Flexible working/Accommodation Review	Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
			x	

First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£0	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£100,000	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£0	x		

The Issue

By introducing enabling IT infrastructure it will be possible to allow staff to work more flexibly and free up work spaces in the Civic Offices. The current ratio of desks allocated to specific staff is very high. Often these work spaces are empty because many staff routinely work offsite as part of their job. Consequently there is a lot of effectively wasted office space which could be used for other purposes and which could potentially generate income or reduce costs for the Council.

The Proposal

The only effective way to maximise the potential for cost saving/income generation is to undertake a comprehensive review of working practices and space utilisation across the whole Council. This is a considerable undertaking and will require help from specialist external resource. The biggest challenge will be to drive the cultural change necessary for staff to think differently about how they work and use office space. Innovative use of technology to enable more efficient flexible working, reduction of paper filing and reduction in duplication of data input will also be critical to the success of the project.

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

The project will undoubtedly will be a considerable change for staff and there is considerable cynicism about the concept, partly due to the fact that the details of the proposal have not yet been clearly set out and partly due to a natural resistance to change. The project will need careful management and sponsorship from senior management. One initial idea is to relocate some of the Community Services staff from Hemnall Street to vacant office space immediately above the new museum extension in Waltham Abbey (and co-locate them with other Community Services staff which also meets a service objective) and then relocate the remaining Community Services staff to the Civic Offices, utilising space freed-up from this proposal. This would then enable the whole of the Hemnall Street offices to be let at a commercial rent. This could generate a potential rental income of upto £100,000 per annum but would require one off capital investment to purchase the office space above the museum. However it is important to note that to achieve the optimum result it is essential to review the whole Council in order to deliver the greatest efficiencies and plan office space effectively.

Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

(1) External specialist resource (IT and buildings specialists) to be funded from part of the transformation reserve of £150k created to enable change.

(2) One-off cost of purchasing vacant office space above Epping Forest Museum – upto £250,000 (dependent on valuation). There is already budget provision of £654,000 within the Capital Programme to purchase all the office space above the museum (as a commercial opportunity), which is no longer available. Some of this budget can therefore be used for the purchase of one office, with the remaining budget provision released for other capital purposes.

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

The figure of £100k is an estimate at this stage and is likely to increase as the project develops. However this is a medium term project that requires initial investment in order to generate sustainable annual CSB savings.

Responsible Officer

TBA

Director

Chief Executive

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Leisure Management Contract		Saving or Income? ("X")	Saving	Income
				£500K	
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£0	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£250K	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£250K	X		

The Issue

In 2005, as a result of a recommendation of a Best Value inspection of Leisure Services, and against a backdrop of increasing pressure on revenue and capital budgets, the Council undertook a comprehensive review of the alternative options available, to manage its leisure facilities. Following this review, the Council elected to pursue the appointment of an external "partner" to manage and develop its major leisure facilities and swimming pools.

Following a competitive procurement process, the Council awarded the contract to Sport and Leisure Management Limited (SLM).

As is the case with the vast majority of local authority leisure provision throughout the country, and in particular, those councils who have an ageing stock of buildings, an element of subsidy is required as generally income from fees and charges does not cover the operating costs. A key objective of seeking alternative management of the Council's facilities had been the transfer of risk of under-achievement of income and the minimalisation of the level of revenue support required.

The current management fees paid to meet the deficit of operating the four centres are detailed below. Due to the quality of the modern facilities provided by Loughton Leisure Centre and its premium location, it does not currently require a deficit payment, rather SLM pay the Council a management fee reflecting the Centre's high revenue potential.

2013-2014 Subsidies

	Management Fees	EFDC Costs	Total Cost	Subsidy per head of population	Subsidy per user
Epping Sports Centre	£301,916	£46,604	£348,520	£2.81	£2.08
Loughton Leisure Centre	-£182,730	£103,700	-£79,030	-£0.64	-£0.18
Ongar Leisure Centre	£286,336	£46,044	£332,380	£2.68	£1.69
Waltham Abbey Pool	£498,278	£48,672	£546,950	£4.41	£2.66
	£903,800	£245,020	£1,148,820	£9.27	£6.25

As part of the budget process for 2014/15 the Council made provision for and has commissioned full building condition surveys for all centres.

However, subject to formal confirmation by the building surveyor's reports and based on pre-tender estimates it has been established that Waltham Abbey Swimming Pool has effectively reached the end of its viable life.

Epping Sports Centre is a conversion of an army drill hall and whilst significant sums have been spent on the roof and tanking the sports hall, the building has very poor access for people with disabilities and has restricted car parking. As such, despite not reaching the unviable position of Waltham Abbey Pool, serious consideration should be given to its replacement in the medium term.

Ongar Leisure Centre, whilst of a similar age to Epping Sports Centre, in part because of its original specification as a dual use centre with higher quality, has a longer viable life than the other two older centres. With the success of the bid to provide a new secondary school in Ongar under the "free schools" programme on the site, an opportunity exists to revert back to the previous dual use arrangements, which would potentially enable a cost sharing arrangement on repairs and running costs to be negotiated.

The Council has considered these issues through the development of its new Leisure and Cultural Strategy, which has made a number of key recommendations which will be formally considered by the Cabinet on the 3 November. These are detailed below.

The Proposal

1. That the Council's Key Objectives with respect to Leisure management are re-affirmed as the basis for any future management contract, with the preferred option being to outsource to either the private sector or external trust.
2. That the procurement approach to the new Leisure Management Contract be by Competitive Dialogue, seeking to deliver flexibility for any partner to develop income streams to reduce costs, whilst still meeting the Council's Key Objectives with respect to participation and community access.
3. That based on the success of other authorities, any new management partners are encouraged to invest in new facilities, which may involve the Council in providing capital finance.
4. That the current relative performance of the Council's Leisure Facilities with respect to cost, participation and subsidy, be noted and form a key consideration with respect to future provision.
5. That subject to confirmation of the final results of the building condition surveys, that Waltham Abbey Pool is deemed to have reached the end of its viable life, and be replaced by a new facility in Waltham Abbey, the part of the District with amongst the poorest health outcomes, with further work undertaken on the most suitable location, and how it may be funded.
6. That in the medium term, depending on growth in the locality, the opportunity to re-provide a replacement facility for Epping Sports Centre should be investigated and that any new Leisure Management Contract has appropriate break clauses to enable relocation.
7. That now confirmation of funding for the new Ongar Academy has been confirmed, and on the basis that the site adjacent to the existing Leisure Centre remains the preferred location, negotiations are entered into with respect to a dual-use arrangement for the Leisure Centre, with the intention of increasing use and sharing cost.

If these recommendations are adopted as the preferred provision and procurement options for the Council, it is anticipated that a revenue saving could be generated, initially to £250k in 2016/17 to reflect new contractual arrangements and the Dual use of Ongar Leisure Centre, and a further £250k if Waltham Abbey Pool was re-provided in 2017/18.

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

The proposal could provide a higher quality provision at lower cost to the Council. The contract period may well need to be over a longer period, 15-20 years, to allow any private sector partner to achieve a return on capital investment. Access for people with disabilities would be improved in new/refurbished provision.

Any required staffing on financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

One off cost of specialist consultancy support £45k already available. May require the Council to invest Capital or facilitate prudential borrowing. With the exception of Client Officers, all other staff have previously been TUPE transferred.

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

Take decision to close any Centre. Savings as table in Section One.

Responsible Officer

Derek Macnab,
Director of Neighbourhoods

Director

Derek Macnab,
Director of Neighbourhoods

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Reduction in FM spend		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
				£50,000	
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£50,000	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£0	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£0	X		

The Issue

The Councils Facilities Management section is responsible for the upkeep of most buildings and infrastructure. The 5 year works programme is updated annually and this includes projects ranging from major building to minor redecoration works. This programme has been adhered to consistently for many years and the vast majority of all properties are in a good state of repair.

The Proposal

Historically there have been consistent underspends within the Facilities Management spread over various budgets. This, coupled with the proposed implementation of improved procurement and contract management processes, will produce the savings highlighted above, without having a long term detrimental effect on the fabric of the buildings or impacting on health and safety.

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

Whilst this saving is achievable, there will inevitably be an impact on the current service provided. There will no longer be any slack in the budget, so in the future, it will not be possible to carry out any unplanned work such as office moves etc. Currently, all office moves are on hold until the overall accommodation strategy has been agreed. If and when any moves are necessary the individual service requiring the move will have to meet the cost.

Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

None

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

Further cuts could be actioned but this would be likely to have a more permanent effect to the fabric of the buildings.

Responsible Officer	David Newton, Assistant Director ICT & FM	Director	Bob Palmer, Director of Resources
---------------------	-------------------------------------------	----------	-----------------------------------

Business Case for Potential CSB Saving/Income

Title	Car parking income		Saving or Income ? ("X")	Saving	Income
					X
First year potential saving / income occurs (+ amount p/a)	2015/16	£250,000	Sensitivity of Proposal ("X")		
	2016/17	£0	Low	Medium	High
	Future	£0			X

The Issue

To increase income from the 17 pay and display car parks in Council ownership. After a 5 year period of no increases in tariff the Council revised pay and display charges on 1 May 2014, with an income target of £150,000 for 2014/15. However the current income profile suggests that the actual income will be lower.

The Proposal

Officers have modelled three options for increasing the parking tariff; low, medium and high. The proposed income target of £250,000 is on the higher tariff increase.

There are additional options (currently not costed): introducing charging (full rate, half rate or a flat rate) in the car parks currently free on Saturdays, all car parks on Sundays, Bank Holidays, Visitors car park in Civic Offices but with a minimum free parking facility for visitors, and charging for Disabled badge holders

Impact and implications of the Proposal (including any equality issues)

Following the increase in tariff in May 2014 the Council's car parking charges are now comparable to the CIPFA nearest neighbour group and other geographically adjoining authorities. If the charges are increased significantly then there is a risk that users will avoid using the car parks and that could have a detrimental impact on income levels. If the number of visitors/shoppers reduces then the high streets and town centres close to the car parks could be negatively affected. Another increase so soon after the May increase could be unpopular with residents, businesses and may have an adverse impact on the shopping areas and high streets.

Increases to the longer/all day parking tariff will impact not only commuters but also local employees. This could have a detrimental impact on the high streets and local businesses.

Charging for disabled badge holders would require a detailed Equality Impact Assessment and there are likely to be costs associated with physical modifications to the car parks.

Any required staffing or financial resources required (e.g. one-off costs) to achieve the saving/income

Capital investment will be required to purchase new smart pay and display meters as well as to carryout changes to the car park notices boards. Estimates of costs will become available once Cabinet has agreed the level of changes required (for example the number of meters that can take credit card payments etc)

Once off revenue expenditure will also be required to advertise and introduce legal traffic variation orders to enable the changes

Any alternative options for different amount(s) of saving/income, including implications

Subject to detailed businesses cases some areas of additional income include:

Boot Sales/Markets/Fayres, BMX & Skateboard Ramps, Go Karts, Drive in Cinema, Firework Display, Lorry Park between 6pm – 6am, Outdoor Concerts/ Bands/Productions, Weekend Fairgrounds, Outdoor Gyms i.e. Boot Camps, Street Soccer Tournaments

Responsible Officer	Qasim Durrani, Assistant Director Technical	Director	Derek Macnab, Director of Neighbourhoods
----------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------------

Briefing note on options for generating more income from car parking services

Background:

The Council is under increasing pressure to generate additional revenue, the estimated additional revenue requirement across the Council is £1 million. This will require a combination of cost savings and additional revenue generation. One option of generating additional income is to increase car parking charges. The Council increased parking charges, after 5 years, in May 2014. It will therefore require careful consideration before significant car parking tariff increase takes place. In 2013/14 the Council gained a pay and display income of £735,000

Anticipated income:

The tariff increase in May 2014 predicted an increased income of £150,000 in 2014/15. The current income trends, as presented in the table in appendix, indicate a likely year end income of £94,740. This is somewhat lower than the estimated income of £150,000 however it has to be borne in mind that the car park income is low in the summer months and the income levels should now pick up.

Bench marking:

In order to assess the scale of increases it is helpful to compare the Council's tariff structure with those authorities that are considered the 'family group' by CIPFA on the basis of geography and demography. For the purposes of this exercise tariff structure of 5 of the 15 CIPFA authorities has been included in the table below, the full list of the family group is attached as appendix:

Nearest Neighbour Group of Parking Authorities (figures in green are below existing EFDC tariff while those in red are above):

Authority	1 hour	2 hour	3 hours	hours 4	hours 5	hours 6
Broxbourne	50p	£1.20	£2.00	£4.00		
Brentwood	£1.30	£2.90	£3.60	£4.40	£5.30	£10.50
East Hertfordshire (Bishops Stortford)	80p	£1.50	£2.20	£2.90	£4.00	£6.00 ALL DAY
Hertford	80p	£1.50	£2.20	£2.90	£3.60	
Harlow	Free	85p	£1.75	£3.60	£6.55	

The following are not in the 'family group' but comparable due to proximity:

Authority	1 hour	2 hour	3 hours	4 hours
Redbridge (Woodford)	80p	£1.40	£2.30	£5.30 over 3 hours
Redbridge (Ilford)	£1.10	£2.20	£3.50	£5.80 over 3 hours
Braintree	90p (Upto 1hr)	£1.80 (1-3 hrs)	£3.00 (3-6 hrs)	£5.50 (over 6hrs)

Income generation:

The Council can achieve additional income by revising car parking charges as well as introducing new charges, for example 9 out of 17 car parks are free on Saturday and all car parks are free on Sunday. There are three free car parks in: Roydon, Chigwell and Epping (outside Civic Offices). A charge, with or without an initial free period could be introduced. Each of these options are discussed below.

1) Pay and Display tariff revision:

The last tariff increase was in May 2014 and the Council can choose another increase to generate more revenue. The tariff could be increased either slightly or significantly. A decision needs to be made on whether the increase would apply to some or all of the car parks (differential tariff) for example the tariff could be increased only in the car parks where there is pressure from users of the London Underground. Cottis Lane Car Park in Epping has a different tariff regime from rest of the short stay car parks in the District. A decision is needed on whether tariff in Cottis Lane should be brought in line with other car parks.

Three variants have been modelled as follows:

- (a) Option 1 - tariff increase in all car parks,
- (b) Option 2 – tariff increase in all car parks except Waltham abbey and Ongar,
- (c) Option 3 - Higher increases in all car parks excluding WA and Ongar.

The table below indicated the three possible tariffs:

Type of car park	Up to 30 min	Up to 1 hr	Up to 2 hr	Over 2 hr	Up to 3 hr	Over 3 hr	Up to 4 hr	Up to 5 hr
Cottis Lane								
Existing	£0.10	£0.70	£1.40		£2.10		£2.80	£3.5
Proposed Option 1	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£2.40		£3.20	£4
Proposed Option 2	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£2.40		£3.20	£4
Proposed Option 3	£0.10	£0.9	£1.80		£2.50		£3.50	£4.5
Short Stay								
Existing	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.0		
Proposed Option 1	£0.10	£0.90	£1.80		£3.50	£10.0		
Proposed Option 2	£0.10	£0.90	£1.80		£3.50	£10.0		
Proposed Option 3	£0.10	£1.0	£2.0		£4.0	£10.0		
Long Stay								
Existing			£1.60	£3.50				
Proposed Option 1			£1.80	£3.80				
Proposed Option 2			£1.80	£3.80				
Proposed Option 3			£2.0	£4.0				
Combined								
Existing	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60	£3.50				
Proposed Option 1	£0.10	£0.90	£1.80	£3.80				
Proposed Option 2	£0.10	£0.90	£1.80	£3.80				
Proposed Option 3	£0.10	£1.0	£2.0	£4.0				

Estimated additional Pay and Display income for the three options:

	Anticipated Pay and Display income for 2014/15	Anticipated Cashless income for 2014/15	Anticipated Season Ticket income for 2014/15	Total income	Additional estimated income over 2014/15
Current tariff	£ 735,000	£ 80,428	£ 75,500	£ 890,928	
Option 1 (modest increase in all car parks)	£ 1,067,883	£ 90,408	£ 113,250	£ 1,271,540	£ 168,999
Option 2 (modest increase in all car parks except Waltham Abbey and Ongar)	£ 1,045,687	£ 89,687	£ 113,250	£ 1,248,623	£ 146,082
Option 3 (higher increase in all car parks except Waltham Abbey and Ongar)	£ 1,110,436	£ 90,797	£135,900	£1,337,133	£ 234,592

The above estimates are based on modelling and as with any model certain assumptions are made. These include the same car park usage and no reduction in demand. A sensitivity analysis has been carried out: a loss of income of £57,000 would occur if 5% of users were to stop using the car parks, this increases to £115,000 if 10% users stop using the service and the loss increases to £170,000 if 15% drop in usage occurs.

2) Weekend and Bank Holiday charging:

There are 9, out of a total of 17, Council car parks that are free on Saturday. Some of these car parks are popular and used on weekends. The total number of spaces in the 9 car parks that are currently free on Saturday is 1129. If a flat rate of £1 per day was charged and assuming a third of these spaces will be utilised the Council could expect an income of:

Saturday charging: $376 \text{ spaces} \times £1 \times 48 = £18,048$

Similarly all of the Council car parks are free on Sunday. This equates to 1754 parking spaces. Applying the same principle of a flat day charge of £1 and assuming that a third of the spaces will be used gives the income of:

Sunday charging: $584 \text{ spaces} \times £1 \times 48 = £28,032$

There are 8 Bank Holidays in a year and the Council does not charge for the use of its car parks. The Council has a choice of introducing normal car parking charging on a Bank Holiday Monday or introduce a flat of £1 per day:

Bank Holiday flat rate charging: $584 \text{ spaces} \times £1 \times 8 = £4,672$

(The income would be higher if normal car parking charging would be introduced on a Bank Holiday)

3) Free Car Park in Roydon, Chigwell and Epping:

The Council has historically provided free car parks in Roydon and Chigwell and in recent past the Visitors Car Park in Civic Offices has been made free to assist businesses in the High Street.

The Roydon Car Park (48 spaces) serves the primary school and businesses in the High Street. It is not proposed to introduce full charging as that would result in displacement parking issues elsewhere in Roydon. However a combination of 2 hours free parking and a nominal all day charge of £1 could be introduced on a trial basis, this would generate, assuming a third of the car park users will pay all day charge, an income of:

Roydon 2 hrs free and £1 all day charge: $16 \text{ spaces} \times £1 \times 365 = £5,840$

The Council owns the car park next to Chigwell Parish Council offices. It is understood that this will be taken over by the Parish Council in the near future. If that was not the case then a similar £1 all day charge could be introduced.

The Visitors Car Park outside the Civic Offices in Epping was until last year only chargeable on Saturday. This was changed and the car park was made free for all seven days of the week to assist the High Street. It has been noticed that the car park is being used by commuters and others for long stay parking. This is taking away spaces from the visitors to the Civic Offices. It is proposed that this car park be brought in line with the Cottis Lane Short Stay Car Park. With the exception to offer two hour free parking to assist visitors to the Council offices. Estimating income for this car park, given the varied tariff, is difficult however a comparison could be made with Cottis Lane Car Park which has a yield of £461 per parking space, excluding the 10p tariff for 30 minutes. If the same yield is applied to the 28 spaces in the Civic Office Car Park the estimated income is £12,908, however the actual income would be less than that due to the provision of 2 hr free parking.

Estimated additional income from all charges:

Source	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Pay and Display increase	£ 168,999 (all car parks)	£ 146,082 (excludes WA and Ongar)	£ 234,592 (excludes WA and Ongar)
Saturday £1 all day	£18,048	£18,048	£18,048
Sunday £1 all day	£28,032	£28,032	£28,032
Bank Holiday £1 all day	£4,672	£4,672	£4,672
Roydon Car Park 2 hrs free and £1 all day	£5,840	£5,840	£5,840
Visitors Car Park Civic Offices, 2 hrs free then same as Cottis Lane Car Park	£12,908	£12,908	£12,908
Total income	£ 238,499	£ 215,582	£ 304,092

Appendix

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL 'NEAREST NEIGHBOUR' GROUP OF FAMILY AUTHORITIES

Council	Address
Broxbourne Borough Council	Borough Offices, Bishop's College, Churchgate, Cheshunt, EN8 9XQ.
Brentwood Borough Council	Council Offices, Ingrave Road, Brentwood, CM15 8AY.
East Hampshire District Council	Penns Place, Petersfield, GU31 4EX
East Hertfordshire District Council	Wallfields, Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8EQ.
Guildford Borough Council	Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4BB
Hertsmere Borough Council	Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood, Herts.
Horsham District Council	Park House, North Street, Horsham, RH12 1RL.
Mid- Sussex District Council	Oaklands, Oaklands Rd, Haywards Heath, RH16 1SS.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	Town Hall, Reigate, RH2 0SH.
Sevenoaks District Council	Council Offices, Argyle Rd, Sevenoaks, TN13 1HG.
Spelthorne Borough Council	Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines, TW18 1XB.
St. Albans City and District Council	Council Offices, Civic Centre, St Peter's Street, St. Albans, AL1 3JE.
Tandridge District Council	Council Offices, Station Rd East, Oxted, RH8 0BT.
Three Rivers District Council	Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, WD3 1RL.
Waverly Borough Council	Council Offices, The Bury's, Godalming, GU7 1HR.

Anticipated income in 2014/15

		Pro rata for 12 months			Pro rata for 12 months	Additional income 2014/15
May to August 2013 Pay and Display income	£390,292	£ 117,0876	May to August 2014 Pay and Display income	£409,268	£122,7804	
May to July 2013 pay by phone income	£19,202	£ 76,807	May to July 2014 pay by phone income	£29,405	£117,619	
Income excluding Season Tickets and Penalty Charge Notices		£ 1,250,683			£1,345,423	£94,740

EFDC Car Park location and tariff information:

Car Park		Spaces	S/L	0-30	UP TO	UP TO	OVER	UP TO	OVER	UP TO	UP TO	FREE
				minutes	1 HR	2 HRS	2 HRS	3 HRS	3 HRS	4 HRS	5 HRS	SATURDAY
Queens Road Lower		100	Long			£1.60	£3.50					✓
Smarts Lane		21	Long			£1.60	£3.50					✓
The Pleasance		73	Long			£1.60	£3.50					✓
Bansons Lane		52	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
Civic Offices		28	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
High Beech		29	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
Old Station Road		270	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
Quaker Lane		109	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
Queens Road Upper		18	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
Sainsburys Ongar		56	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
The Drive		41	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
Vere Road		50	Short	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60		£3.20	£10.00			X
Bakers Lane		141	S/L	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60	£3.50					✓
Cornmill		197	S/L	£0.10	£3.80	£1.60	£3.50					✓
Darby Drive		69	S/L	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60	£3.50					✓
Traps Hill		188	S/L	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60	£3.50					✓
Burton Road		99	S/L	£0.10	£0.80	£1.60	£3.50					✓
Cottis Lane		213	Short	£0.10	£0.70	£1.40		£2.10		£2.80	£3.50	✓