

Overview of Responses and Recommendations

| Budget Proposals 2024/25: Reduce funding for gully emptying and bridge maintenance | | Service Director: Jon Winstanley Author: Peter Walker | | 8 February 2024 Version 1 (Scrutiny Commission) | |
|--|--|--|--------------------|--|---------|
| Proposal: | To reduce the annual funding by: | | | | |
| | Programme | Budget reduction (£) | % of budget | | |
| | Bridge maintenance | £80,000 | 44% | | |
| | Gully emptying | £50,000 | 25% | | |
| | Total | £130,000 | 32% | | |
| Total budget 2023/24: | £384,050 | Initial proposed saving 2024/25: | £130,000 (32%) | Recommended saving 2024/25: | £80,000 |
| No. of responses: | <p>In total, 279 responses were received through the survey. The breakdown of responses is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 263 - A resident of West Berkshire • 6 - A visitor to West Berkshire • 11 - A West Berkshire business owner • 12 - Employed by a West Berkshire business • 6 - Employed by West Berkshire Council • 15 - A Parish/Town Councillor • 1 - A District Councillor • 1 - A partner organisation • 0 - A West Berkshire Council service provider • 13 – Other <p>We also received direct responses from Reading West & Mid Berkshire CLP and Newbury CLP, Thatcham Town Council, and Tilehurst and Basildon Parish Councils. We received no petitions.</p> | | | | |

NB: This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report for this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation and Engagement Hub](#).

Overview of Responses and Recommendations

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Budget Proposals 2024/25: Reduce funding for gully emptying and bridge maintenance | | Service Director: Jon Winstanley Author: Peter Walker | 8 February 2024 Version 1 (Scrutiny Commission) |
| Key issues raised: | <p>The focus of most comments was on gully emptying, the increased risk of flooding, and the impacts that is likely to have. These include damage to roads and properties, increased insurance claims, impacts on mental health and possible loss of life. Whilst there were fewer comments on bridge maintenance, it was noted that this would have to be managed carefully for safety reasons. The proposal to reduce gully emptying and bridge maintenance was considered most likely to increase future costs. Weather experienced this year has already demonstrated that drainage needs improving.</p> <p>Over 96% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed (84%) with the proposals for gully emptying, whereas it was 72% for bridge maintenance.</p> | | |
| Equality issues: | No issues were raised during the consultation, that weren't already included in the EqIA stage one. | | |
| Suggestions for reducing the impact on service users: | Suggestion | Council response | |
| | Consider different gully designs. | There are no alternatives. | |
| | Maintain gully emptying where there is a risk of flooding, where most people would be adversely affected, and when storms are forecast. | Works would be prioritised where most risk has been identified. | |
| | Allow residents to clear gullies, or parish councils to award private gully cleaning contracts. | Residents and parish councils can keep gullies clear of leaves. | |
| | Ensure surface water road drains are cleared regularly. Increase road sweeper activity to remove leaves and debris. | Additional clearing will cost more money. | |

NB: This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report for this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation and Engagement Hub](#).

Overview of Responses and Recommendations

| Budget Proposals 2024/25: Reduce funding for gully emptying and bridge maintenance | | Service Director: Jon Winstanley Author: Peter Walker | 8 February 2024 Version 1 (Scrutiny Commission) |
|--|--|--|--|
| | Provide a better response to public identification of blocked gullies. | The Council has invested in a new reporting tool which is working well. | |
| | Provide more flood defences and better drainage. | The Council has invested in flood alleviation schemes across West Berkshire in partnership with the Environment Agency. Another is underway in Thatcham, and further schemes are being considered. | |
| | Ensure land owners clear their ditches. | Although we have powers, this is resource-intensive and takes time. | |
| | Issue sandbags. | The Council policy is not to issue sandbags as they are generally not very effective, and there are considerable environmental issues with their use. | |
| | Install traffic lights where roads are likely to flood. | The cost of installation, operation and maintenance would not be efficient use of resources for temporary problems. Emergency lights may occasionally be installed. | |
| | Limit HGV movements and consider weight limits for heavier vehicles. | Where bridges are deemed to be at greater risk, weight limits are introduced. | |
| | Do not allow developments in flood plains. | All developments are considered against Council policies. | |
| | Better communication. | The Council has provided improved communication regarding flooding including how to register for warnings and owners' responsibilities. | |
| Alternative options for applying the | Suggestion | Council response | |
| | Saving could be made for one year only. | There is no specific information to indicate that West Berkshire Council will be in an improved financial position in one year's time. | |

NB: This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report for this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation and Engagement Hub](#).

Overview of Responses and Recommendations

| Budget Proposals 2024/25: Reduce funding for gully emptying and bridge maintenance | | Service Director: Jon Winstanley Author: Peter Walker | 8 February 2024 Version 1 (Scrutiny Commission) |
|---|--|---|--|
| saving in this area: | The contract could be renegotiated or brought back into the Council. | The contract is currently under review and will need to be retendered by 2026. | |
| | The contractor could do a better job. | Contract performance is monitored regularly, and the contractor is meeting Key Performance Indicators. | |
| | Surface water road drains should be cleared regularly. | Additional clearing will cost more money. | |
| | Parish councils could contribute. | We would welcome any contributions. | |
| | Local farmers may be cheaper than contractor. | They are unlikely to have the required specialist equipment, and there would also be issues with insurance. | |
| | Look at technological advancements for monitoring. | The Council are already looking at, and introducing, technological advances. | |
| Suggestions for income generation: | Suggestion | Council response | |
| | Introduce speed cameras. | Income from speed cameras goes to the Police. | |
| | Charge for discretionary services. Generate solar energy from roofs and above car parks. | These are already being actively happening, or in progress. | |
| | Increase council tax. Receive adequate government funding. | Levels are set by government. | |
| Increase charges for use of community spaces and halls. Ensure full occupancy of Council-run care homes. Allow more | These are matters for other parts of the Council to consider. | | |

NB: This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report for this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation and Engagement Hub](#).

Overview of Responses and Recommendations

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Budget Proposals 2024/25: Reduce funding for gully emptying and bridge maintenance | | Service Director: Jon Winstanley Author: Peter Walker | 8 February 2024 Version 1 (Scrutiny Commission) |
| | housing. Keep the green bin subscription and increase with inflation. | | |
| Officer conclusion and recommendation as a result of the responses: | Given the largely negative views on reducing spend on gully emptying, and the impacts this could exacerbate, this is not recommended. Although reducing bridge maintenance spend was also mostly negative, very few comments were received and it is recommended that this budget is reduced for a limited time of one to two years. | | |

NB: This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report for this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation and Engagement Hub](#).