SCIA 07 (24/25)

Portfolio / Chief Officer: Adrian Rowbotham

Service: Pest Control
Activity Full Service
No. of Staff 1 FTE

Details of proposed change	Cost Centre & Account Code of Budget	2024/25 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Stop service	FAL	45	Ongoing

## Box 1. Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

This is a loss on the Councils budget, dependent on the members decision regarding the service review.

Details are included in a report to CGAC and Cabinet.

#### Box 2. Key Stakeholders Affected:

# Box 3. Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

This is a non-statutory service and loss making service. We would not provide pest control services to customers and sign post them to local providers.

### Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low.			

#### Cost Centre 2023/24 Budget (£'000)

Operational Cost	41
Income	(86)
Net Cost	(45)

#### Service Budget 2023/24 (relating to the area effect by this SCIA)

Operational Cost	41
Income	(86)
Net Cost	(45)

## **Equality Assessment**

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

## **Net Zero Implications**

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the council's ambition to be Net Zero by 2030. There is no perceived impact regarding either an increase or decrease in carbon emissions in the district, or supporting the resilience of the natural environment.

SCIA 08 (24/25)

Portfolio / Chief Officer: Adrian Rowbotham

Service: Cesspool Activity Full Service No. of Staff 2 FTE

Details of proposed change	Cost Centre & Account Code of Budget	2024/25 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Stop service	FAJ	66	Ongoing

### Box 1. Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

This is a loss on the Councils budget, dependent on the members decision regarding the service review.

Details are included in a report to CGAC and Cabinet.

### Box 2. Key Stakeholders Affected:

**Existing customers** 

# Box 3. Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

This is a non-statutory service. We would not provide cesspool services to customers and sign post them to local providers. Large capital investment in a new vehicle would be avoided.

## Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

	Low.				
ı					

#### Cost Centre 2023/24 Budget (£'000)

Operational Cost	209
Income	(275)
Net Cost	(66)

### Service Budget 2023/24 (relating to the area effect by this SCIA)

Operational Cost	209
Income	(275)
Net Cost	(66)

## **Equality Assessment**

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

#### **Net Zero Implications**

Members are reminded of the Council's stated ambition to be Net Zero with regards to carbon emissions by 2030. The decisions recommended in this paper directly impact on this ambition. The impact has been reviewed and there will be an (increase or decrease) on carbon emissions produced in the district as a result of this decision.

This will be achieved through a fleet/vehicle reduction of emissions and fuel through a reduction of a diesel HGV vehicle being used across the district.

SCIA 09 (24/25)

Portfolio / Chief Officer: Adrian Rowbotham

Service: Refuse

Activity: Supply and deliver black waste sacks.

No. of Staff 0 FTE

Details of proposed change	Cost Centre & Account Code of Budget	2024/25 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
To remove the supply of black sacks to residents.	50800 DSREFSA 2127	(100)	Ongoing

#### Box 1. Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

This is a saving on not purchasing black waste sacks.

Delivery saving is on the recycling sacks SCIA.

## Box 2. Key Stakeholders Affected:

All residents across the district, plus our sack's supplier.

# Box 3. Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

Resident would need to purchase their own black sacks to present waste for curb side waste collections.

## Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Medium.			

#### Cost Centre 2023/24 Budget (£'000)

Operational Cost	296
Income	(11)
Net Cost	285

### Service Budget 2023/24 (relating to the area effect by this SCIA)

Operational Cost	296
Income	(0)
Net Cost	296

#### **Equality Assessment**

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

l

#### **Net Zero Implications**

Members are reminded of the Council's stated ambition to be Net Zero with regards to carbon emissions by 2030. The decisions recommended in this paper directly impact on this ambition. The impact has been reviewed and there will be a decrease on carbon emissions produced in the district as a result of this decision.

This will be achieved through a fleet/vehicle reduction of emissions and fuel by not delivering sacks to 53,000 properties twice yearly.

SCIA 10 (24/25)

Portfolio / Chief Officer: Adrian Rowbotham

Service: Refuse

Activity: Supply and deliver recycling sacks

No. of Staff 1 FTE

Details of proposed change	Cost Centre & Account Code of Budget	2024/25 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.) £000
Provide recycling 'bags for life'.  This budget is for the purchase of recycling sacks. It is proposed that recycling sacks are replaced with bags for life in 2024/25. In 2025/26 there will be a saving on this budget as resident will have the bag for life.	50800 DSREFSA 2127 94300 DSREFSA 9999	0	(165) from 2025/26 Then ongoing
1 FTE for delivering sacks.	20500 FAA 8070	0	(32) from 2025/26 Then ongoing

#### Box 1. Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

This is a £176,000 saving on not purchasing and delivery sacks recycling sacks and a £11,000 loss of income on the sales of sacks.

Additional saving to agency staff (1FTE) is currently employed to deliver sacks.

## Box 2. Key Stakeholders Affected:

All residents across the district, plus the sack supplier.

# Box 3. Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

Residents would need to get used to using a different bag for their recycling waste.

## Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Medium.	Medium.			
---------	---------	--	--	--

#### Cost Centre 2023/24 Budget (£'000)

Operational Cost	296
Income	(11)
Net Cost	285

### Service Budget 2023/24 (relating to the area effect by this SCIA)

Operational Cost	296
Income	(11)
Net Cost	285

#### **Equality Assessment**

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

#### **Net Zero Implications**

Members are reminded of the Council's stated ambition to be Net Zero with regards to carbon emissions by 2030. The decisions recommended in this paper directly impact on this ambition. The impact has been reviewed and there will be a decrease on carbon emissions produced in the district as a result of this decision.

This will be achieved through a fleet/vehicle reduction of emissions and fuel by not delivering sacks to 53,000 properties twice yearly.

SCIA 12 (24/25)

Portfolio / Chief Officer: Richard Morris

Service: Environmental Health

**Activity:** Air Quality Monitoring Stations

No. of Staff 0 FTE

Details of proposed change	Cost Centre & Account Code of Budget	2024/25 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Closure of the Bat & Ball and Greatness Air Quality Stations	EHSERVE	(32)	Ongoing

#### Box 1. Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

'The Future of Air Quality Monitoring within Sevenoaks District' report was presented to the Cleaner and Greener Advisory Committee on 10/10/23 and Cabinet on 12/10/23.

#### Cabinet resolved that:

- a) a partner to take over the management and operating costs of the Air Quality Stations (Bat & Ball and/or Greatness Park) from 1st April 2024, be sought by the Environmental Health Team;
- b) if a suitable partner cannot be identified as above; that on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2024 the Air Quality Monitoring Stations at Bat & Ball and Greatness Park are closed and decommissioned, be agreed.
- c) in replacement of the two existing Air Quality Stations; the District Council seek to develop a network of portable Air Quality Analysers to be sited strategically in areas of poorest air quality. The scale and extent of this network, be subject to technical constraints and available funding from within existing Environmental Health budgets and/ or additional grant funding (or similar) if and when available, be agreed.

#### Box 2. Key Stakeholders Affected:

Sevenoaks Residents

Developers in the relevant areas

# Box 3. Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

See previous report.			

### Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low risk- The data at these stations has been compliant with national objective levels for several years and there is considered to be no/ minimal risk to Environmental Health Service objectives.

#### Cost Centre 2023/24 Budget (£'000)

Operational Cost	801
Income	(30)
Net Cost	771

## Service Budget 2023/24 (relating to the area effect by this SCIA)

Operational Cost	32
Income	0
Net Cost	32

#### **Equality Assessment**

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

#### **Net Zero Implications**

The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the council's ambition to be Net Zero by 2030. There is no perceived impact regarding either an increase or decrease in carbon emissions in the district.