

**Addendum to the Report of the Director of Finance to
the meeting of Executive to be held on 31st January
2022 (Document AP)**

Addendum 1

**Subject: 2023-24 BUDGET UPDATE – Addendum to Appendix B – Consultation
Feedback and Equality Assessments for the Council Budget Proposals for 2023-24**

Addendum to Appendix B

CONSULTATION FEEDBACK AND EQUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR THE COUNCIL BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 2023-24

1. SUMMARY

The report (Document AP) of the Director of Finance, IT and Procurement was published on the 23 January 2023 to be presented to the Executive at the meeting to be held on the 31 January 2023.

This addendum reflects feedback received from the public consultation in relation to the budget proposals 2023-24 since the report was prepared and should be considered alongside Appendix B to Document AP

The public consultation concluded on the 25 January 2023.

2. UPDATES TO THE LEVELS OF FEEDBACK RECEIVED THROUGH THE CONSULTATION

- 2.1 At the conclusion of the consultation, the Council had received comments from 873 people or groups through the online questionnaire. It had received two postal questionnaires and 14 representations had been made through emails or letters.
- 2.2 Monitoring of the corporate social media accounts and Stay Connected newsletters on the budget consultation had shown 83 opinions from residents which have been included in the overall consultation feedback.
- 2.3 The level of response is significantly increased compared to recent years' budget proposals consultations. The majority of the response is in relation to the proposal R41 – Waste Review, but in particular the potential to close the Keighley Household Waste and Recycling Centre.
- 2.4 In addition, a public petition opposing the potential closure of the Keighley Household Waste and Recycling Centre was presented at Full Council on the 24 January 2023.
- 2.5 The proposals generating most comments are:

R41 - Waste Services review
Drawing the most comments and feedback, both online and in meetings, not one respondent, through whatever means, was supportive of this proposal. Respondents and participants believed it contradicted the Council's policies for recycling and clean air, they felt it was a proposal made in Bradford for Keighley. Many stated if implemented it would impact the environment through increased fly tipping and impact low income families, those with disabilities and older people through the need to drive further to dispose of waste. Many suggestions were made to negate the need to close the household waste and recycling site. Those in the meetings were passionate about Keighley and maintaining vital services there.
Increase in Council Tax by 2.99% (and Social Care Precept 2%)

<p>Respondents did not feel the rise was justified given the current cost of living crisis, that the increase was unaffordable for many and others felt the reduction in services didn't warrant the increase. More help was called for in supporting those on low income. One respondent suggested increasing it further so that long term solutions could be implemented.</p>
<p>AppC Environmental Health – Support recruitment to enable the Council to meet its statutory requirements and meet demand generated through City of Culture</p>
<p>Along with those responding to social media posts and news releases, one comment was made through the online survey about this proposal, concerns were raised in relation to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean Air Zone • Land pressures, abandoned land and buildings • District's environmental image is poor • CO2 emissions • City of Culture paying for it

3 Consultation – Responses and feedback received

3.1 The number of comments received through responses to the survey, social media, and news releases for each of the proposals under consultation was as follows:

Ref	Proposal	Number of comments		Total
		Online Survey	Social media posts/ news releases	
4.8	Increase in Council Tax 2.99% and Social Care Precept of 2%	36	40	76
7.10	Replacement of Vehicles - £3m	0	0	0
7.10	Property Programme - £4m.	0	0	0
7.10	General contingency for unforeseen capital expenditure - £1m.	0	2	2
7.10	IT Device Refresh Programme - £2m.	0	0	0
7.11	PCS1 City Centre Regeneration.	1	1	2
7.11	PCS2 Inflation Contingency.	0	0	0
App A	Children's social care pressures	0	5	5
App A	Adults Social Care Pressures – part reversal of a prior Demand Management Saving	2	1	3
App C	SEND Improvement Plan - Additional investment in SEND in line with improvement plan	1	0	1
App C	Environmental Health – Support recruitment to enable the Council to meet its statutory requirements and meet demand generated through City of Culture	1	27	28
App C	Digital Autopsy Scanner - investment in the digital autopsy (non-invasive post mortem) service	1	0	1
App C	Share of Mortuary Staffing Costs - required to address a shortfall identified following inspection from HTA (Regulator).	0	0	0

Ref	Proposal	Number of comments		Total
		Online Survey	Social media posts/ news releases	
CH6	Aspiration Bradford – Cease Service	0	0	0
CH8	Child Friendly City – Reduce non-staffing Costs.	0	0	0
CR25	Digital Mailroom – Reduce outgoing mail and printing costs.	0	0	0
CR4	Vacancy Review & Abatement Factor – keep vacant posts unfilled for longer.	3	0	3
CR6	Estates – The temporary closure of two city centre office buildings to reduce costs.	5	1	6
CR8	IT Services – IT Strategy.	0	0	0
HW7	Changes to Adult Social Care Non-Residential Charges– This is being separately consulted on.	0	0	0
R40	Parking Permits and Charges Budget Proposal.	3	3	6
R41	Waste Review.	820	3	823
R52	PTH Improvement Plan implementation.	0	0	0
R53	Opening of a Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for the start of the financial year 2023-24	0	0	0
R54	CCTV commercialisation.	0	0	0
R71	Fleet Review.	1	0	1
	Total	873	83	956

3.2 Annex 1 below provides additional comments against those proposals where survey responses have been received since the initial report (Document AP) was prepared and published.

Annex 1 – Consultation feedback and suggestions against specific budget proposals and equality impacts of those proposals received since the initial report was prepared and published (Document AP to Executive 31 January 2023).

Proposals that were open to consultation and that received further comments since the initial report was prepared and published are provided below. New comments, equality impacts and suggested changes are in **bold**. are included in the tables below.

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
4.8	Council Tax increase of 2.99%	Council Tax EIA	<p>Thirty-six respondents commented through the online survey. All but one was against the proposals</p> <p>Forty comments were received in response to social media posts or news releases. All were against the proposals</p>	<p>Equality impact feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on low income households, carers, older people and those struggling due to the cost of living crisis ▪ <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p>
4.8	Social Care Precept.	Social Care Precept EIA	<p>A summary of the feedback is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5% increase not affordable or justified during the cost of living crisis ▪ May not raise expected amount due to the District's demographics ▪ Tax goes up but services not improving/accountable (such as Children's) ▪ Stop the spend on IT and new vehicles and save £5m ▪ Raise by maximum allowed as need to support services ▪ 5% will put people into fuel and general poverty ▪ All subsidising use of social care services ▪ Raise is negatively impacting mental health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focus on basic services such as waste, safer streets etc. ▪ Cancel new buildings ▪ Reduce costs by: not engaging consultants/agency staff, reducing number of councillors and removing refreshments from their meetings, cutting staff pay, improving efficiency, not spending on IT and vehicles, not spending on Darley Street, not spending on city of culture and events, ▪ Seek government help ▪ People on benefits shouldn't have to pay ▪ Reduce the proposed increase or freeze ▪ Increase Council Tax further to enable proper improvement etc. ▪ Stop being a City of Sanctuary and culture ▪ Close offices, increase working from home ▪ Sell assets ▪ Charge businesses more ▪ Better programme support to stop projects overspending ▪ Invest in renewables ▪ Incentivise prompt payment of council tax ▪ Drop the 1% for local initiatives

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make all the information available and tell people what has already been decided ▪ Invest in towns and not just the city centre ▪ Half the proposed increase ▪ Exempt carers, low income households, and the vulnerable from paying at the moment ▪ Stop putting this up
7.11	PCS1 City Centre Regeneration.	No equalities impact(s) identified.	<p>One direct comment was received and other feedback was received via the online survey in relation to the proposal to increase Council Tax and the Social Care Precept 2% and through the general comments.</p> <p>In addition, one comment was made in response to social media posts or news releases. The comment was against the proposals.</p> <p>The VCS made a comment about this proposal</p> <p>A summary of the feedback and comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cancel new buildings ▪ Utilise existing premises rather than build new ones (1 City Park) ▪ Concerned about improvements to pedestrianisation ▪ Who decides which capital projects go forward? ▪ Need detail of what this is to be spent on 	<p>Equality impact feedback: None received</p> <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involve people in discussions about projects ▪ Support existing services. Borrowing costs are high currently
Appendix A	Adults Social Care Pressures – part reversal of a prior Demand	No equalities impact(s) identified.	One comment was received via the online survey.	<p>Equality impact feedback: None received</p> <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p>

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
	Management Saving.		<p>One comment was made in response to social media posts or news releases. The comment was against the proposals.</p> <p>A summary of the comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about the family and mental health support ▪ How has the pandemic caused costs to rise? 	<p>▪ Provide more detail to enable people to comment</p>
Appendix C	Environmental Health – Support recruitment to enable the Council to meet its statutory requirements and meet demand generation through City of Culture.	No equalities impact(s) identified.	<p>No feedback was received via the online survey. One comment was made through the online survey</p> <p>Twenty-seven comments were received in response to social media posts or news releases. All were against the proposal.</p> <p>Summary of the comments:</p> <p>Concerns were raised about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clean Air Zone - Land pressures, abandoned land and buildings - District's environmental image is poor - CO2 emissions - General funds should not be supporting this 	<p>Equality impact feedback: None received</p> <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City of Culture should be providing the funding
Appendix C	Digital Autopsy Scanner – investment in the digital autopsy (non-invasive post-mortem) service.	No equalities impact(s) identified.	<p>One comment was received via the online survey</p> <p>Consider this to be a luxury</p>	<p>Equality impact feedback: None</p> <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p> <p>Use existing or charge people for the digital service</p>

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
CR4	Vacancy Review & Abatement Factor – keep vacant posts unfilled for longer.	No equalities impact(s) identified.	<p>One comment was received via the online survey</p> <p>Summary of the comment:</p> <p>If unfilled, are the jobs needed?</p>	<p>Equality impact feedback:</p> <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review all posts ▪ Scrap unnecessary posts to make permanent savings
R40	Car Parking – Implement consistent parking regime.	Car Parking EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three respondents commented through the online survey. Neither were supportive. • Three comments were received in response to social media posts or news releases. All were against the proposal. • A summary of the feedback and comments is as follows: • Town centre car parks should be free for one hour • Concern raised about charges at car parks • Issues with current permit scheme due to visitor limits and fines being imposed • Current scheme not suitable for Steeton • Limits people's social contact • Pressure on parking low in Steeton so unfair to impose this scheme • Concerned about bus lane fines, cycle lanes • There is potential for a park and ride scheme in the city centre • Wrong to charge people to park outside their council taxed homes • Business permits introduced without consultation. It's affecting footfall. 	<p>Equality impact feedback:</p> <p>Negative impact on older people as have more visitors and will incur more costs</p> <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No charge for 2nd permit where low demand on parking • Change current policy to allow one hour free parking (in town centres) • Fine people for littering • Relocate council staff in fewer buildings • Reduce agency staff costs

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
R41	Waste Review – Reviewing waste services to reduce costs and maximise efficiencies including the potential closure of Keighley Household Waste and Recycling site, one of the least used sites and reducing hours at all HWRCs.	Waste Review EIA	<p>The majority of respondents to the online survey, 820, commented on this proposal along with 2 postal surveys. All the comments were in relation to the potential closure of the Keighley Waste and Recycling Centre. None of those responding via the online survey were in favour of the potential closure of the site.</p> <p>Three comments were received in response to social media posts or news releases. All were against the proposal.</p> <p>The VCS commented on this proposal.</p> <p>Keighley and Shipley drop-in session participants commented on this proposal</p> <p>Objection letters were submitted about the proposal from the Aire Valley River Trust and The River Worth Friends. Twelve people also lodged their objections via mail, email or through our customer contact centre.</p> <p>A summary of the feedback is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tip is well used by Keighley, Steeton & Eastburn and Silsden residents and is always busy but queuing is on a quiet road – the data is incorrect • Lots of new house builds in the area – so need the facility • Implementation risks: increasing fly tipping and costs to deal with it (more than needed to upgrade the tip) – blighting the landscape, 	<p>Equality impact feedback:</p> <p>Large number of older people living in the area that the site serves</p> <p>Site provides easier access than alternative sites for people with mobility issues</p> <p>Impact on people who are incontinent as provides close and accessible site for disposal of personal soiled waste, such as adult diapers</p> <p>Impact those on low income as would need to pay more for fuel to travel to other sites</p> <p>Impact on carers/parents who have limited time to spend away from those they care for</p> <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't close the site – make it more user friendly and promote • Close the council buildings sooner to save money • Relocate the site • Review planning restrictions with a view to increasing opening hours • If you must, shut somewhere else, such as somewhere in Bradford– keep this site open and promote it • Keep all HWRC sites open • Remove building at back of the site to make it bigger and capable of accommodating larger skips

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
			<p>increasing landfill and costs, traffic and safety issues at and around other sites especially Sugden End on Halifax Road (busy A629) – this site is also currently experiencing long queues, reduced rates of household recycling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keighley has 50k residents – largest town in the district, should have its own HWRC • Site provides good access for people, is central and causes minimal disruption traffic and residents • Requirement to travel further would increase air pollution (against Council clean air policy), not environmentally or wildlife friendly • Bradford making decisions that affect Keighley • Valued by and essential to Keighley residents and businesses • Closure would mean only one site in district for plaster board waste • Feel unheard, excluded • Added costs for residents to dispose of their waste • Listen to residents about this and other initiatives • losing the tip would make it harder for residents to dispose of green waste • Fuel drive to leave the LA • Could increase vermin due to people retaining waste • No car so won't be able to use alternative sites • Need to consider the wider impacts of closure i.e. Health, environmental • Keighley people don't want the incinerator but do want the tip 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spend less on other things such as city of culture/city centre events – Keighley doesn't see this • Impose a small charge for use • Staff pay cut • Reduce/change hours, alter staffing at all sites rather than close • Alternative staffing arrangements • Reduce spend on city centre projects • Invest in the site • Reduce spend on bureaucracy • Invest in Keighley • Increase enforcement fines • Look long term at what support needed by all people • Buy Airedale Shopping centre, sell Kirkgate in Bradford to fund our services • Encourage more recycling • Provide a 'salvage' shop – selling on recycled goods • Save money, cut top management • Listen to people • Look for cuts elsewhere – management, funding for social and health organisations • Relook at criteria for determining which site to close – road safety also important • Get volunteers to help reclaim and sell reusable items – proceeds to charity • Forward plan and invest in services and facilities in Keighley – tip, police station etc. • Cut councillors wages, reduce spend on non-essentials such as Christmas lights • If closes collect green and grey bins every week • Stop funding ineffective schemes like the cycle lanes • Use brownfield sites for new industrial units rather than close the tip • Save money by planting perineal in flower beds

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a financial incentive to the closure – it's on prime industrial land • Reducing opening hours at all tips will increase traffic queuing, congestion and air pollution • Keighley becoming rundown– this will add to the 'ghost town' feel. • What services are Keighley residents getting for the increase in Council Tax? • Proposal does not align with the 'sustainable district' or discharge the local development plan's Waste Management Development Plan • Feels like the Council don't want to have services in Keighley/Ilkley • Planning restrictions could be lifted as other local circumstances have changed negating the need • Waste will still come into Keighley TLS • More skip movements will take place at other sites • Closing would cost more in the long run • Put it to a public vote • Site is good for road safety unlike alternatives suggested • Risk of harm to wildlife and humans due to fly tipping of toxic substances • Proposal due to Keighley not being 'Labour' • Area's natural beauty will be impacted by more fly tipping, leading to a reduction in tourists • Relocation of site staff (considered friendly and efficient) unfair • Will lead to build up of waste in gardens • Need to prioritise Keighley's needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't spend on IT and new vehicles • Reduce jobs in the council • Manage performance of staff – social work, education • Take Keighley residents views into account • Let local town councils manage funding for services • Use enforcement on roads etc. to bring in funding • Change the skips to the larger, cheaper to run ones • Use incinerator site for new Keighley HWRC site • Look at provision in other LA areas • Not reasonable to remove service that Keighley people are paying for • More regular street clean-ups • Provide an alternative site if want to use for industrial units and jobs • Encourage people to use the tips with offers • Call on government for more funding – council tax higher in north east than elsewhere • Don't spend on Children's Trust – duplicating salaries • Treat Keighley fairly • Withdraw the proposal • Link up your policies • Take note of Keighley residents views • Close Sugden End instead • Audit of council spend before deciding to close this service • Separate Keighley from Bradford • Reduce opening times of HWRC sites • Increase car park charges • Charge to enter Council museums etc. e.g. Cliffe Castle • Reduce the number of hours of street lighting • Use Council Tax from Keighley to support Keighley • Promote waste services and sites

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase landfill as more recyclables will end up in general waste • Poses a major inconvenience to Keighley residents • Likely increase in litter in Keighley • Also required to accommodate needs of new housing • The closure would increase calls for Keighley's independence • Not enough evidence provided to support this proposal – each element of savings should have been broken down • Opening hours cited, but only 3 less than other sites – which would all reduce if the proposal is accepted, also against the principles in the Council's Waste Management Plan in the Local Development Plan 2017 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give discounts to use Council facilities, i.e., leisure centres, to get more people using them to increase income • Collect the bins weekly or keep the tip open • Improve KHWRC efficiency to get more cars through • Increase sites hours • Improve KHWRC access and egress • Offer free bulky waste collections • Give Keighley own funding/separate from Bradford • Stop funding vanity projects • Big clean up once a year – Council take all waste from kerbside • Make it easier for 'fly tipplers' to use sites than fly tip • Generate income with traffic fines • More cleaning of drainage and road debris • Add 'soft plastic' to what can be recycled at the KHWRC site • Treat staff respectfully – tell them before proposals published • Resell recycled items, offer workshops in upcycling and create jobs/apprenticeships around the initiative • More patrols in Keighley • Use what heard to decide and not as a tick box exercise • Improve access for vans and separate of cars/vans at the site to improve efficiency • Revert to opening at 8am to avoid school traffic • Fund essential services only • Take fly tipping more seriously and let people know the outcomes from their reporting it
			<p>Several comments made about R41 Waste Review related to the closure of the Keighley 'business waste site'.. Others were concerned that gritters would be located in Bradford. Waste Services have confirmed this is not part of the proposal. Waste Services has responded these are not part of the proposal</p>	

Ref	Proposal for change	As published December 2022	Consultation feedback about the proposal	Consultation feedback about equality impacts / Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals
		Equalities Impact/ Mitigations		
R71	Fleet Review: Transformation programme Looking at Fleet efficiencies that includes reducing Grey Fleet, centralising budgets, reducing the use and costs of hire vehicles, value for money planned replacement plans.	Fleet Review EIA	<p>One comment was received via the online survey</p> <p>The VCS commented on this proposal.</p> <p>Summary of comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with how the passenger transport service runs • Allow VCS to use vehicles out of hours 	<p>Equality impact feedback:</p> <p>Suggested changes from consultees to the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only replace vehicles when need to • Defer buying electric until price reduces • Cut down on the number of vehicles used by the Council

SUMMARY OF OTHER COMMENTS received following preparation and publication and of Document AP and NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

Theme	Comments
Road Safety/Highways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bingley – suggests improvement to student road safety at Wagon Lane and Beckfoot • Roads around Keighley need improving
Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More CCTV and police presence needed in Keighley
Clean Air Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repurpose and green existing buildings rather than build new • Stop the CAZ, reducing visitor numbers damaging businesses and impeding post pandemic recovery
Funding/investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget for increase in jobs and more opportunities for youth • Review the cost of the Aire Valley trunk road footbridge - £11m is too much • Funds need to be used evenly across the District • Cut senior officers wages, not services • Help homeless • Invest in Keighley Town and services • Lower business rates for Keighley shops to encourage them to stay
Health and childcare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't reduce budgets in these areas
Bin collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the service, collections are not often enough

Public face to face drop in events following preparation and publication of Document AP

Salvation Army, Wibsey, Bradford South – 24 January, 6-7pm

No public participants