Subject of assessment:	**Middlesbrough Council budget 2016-7**			**Appendix C**
Coverage:	Crosscutting			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☒ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☒ **Review**
	☒ **Organisational change**	☒ **Other (please state) Budget**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☒
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☒	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☒
Description:	Key aims, objectives and activities By law the Council has to agree a balanced budget annually. The purpose of this Impact Assessment is to assess the cumulative impact of the 2016/17 budget proposals. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) places a statutory duty on the Council to ensure that identified where decisions would impact disproportionately adversely on groups that share a protected characteristic under UK law. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. To ensure compliance with the PSED the Council has to identify what the impact of proposals will be. Where there is a risk that they will have a disproportionate adverse impact, consideration must be given to steps needed to avoid or mitigate that impact. Mitigation will include steps to take account of the different needs of groups and may result in adjustments to meet their needs. Where decisions cannot be fully mitigated or avoided, they must be justified. Proposals have been developed which protect frontline services and the town's most vulnerable groups as far as possible, with changes made to the way the Council delivers services where possible, rather than to the level of service provided. The proposals for the 2016/17 budget were split into three categories when first presented to Council on 25 November 2015: • Appendix A - Initiatives requiring no public consultation i.e. either having no public impact, or having been already impact-assessed, mitigated where possible and / or justified. Some internal consultation may be required if the initiatives have a significant impact on employees. • Appendix B - Initiatives that will be subject to the impact assessment process and on which the Council will consult prior to implementation in 2016/17. • Appendix C - Initiatives that may require separate consultations and / or impact assessments in future years as proposals are further developed. Following this announcement, a screening assessment was completed on those proposals contained in Appendix B of the November 2015 Council report. Of these proposals, nine: • have been implemented and were impact assessed as part of separate consultation and decision making processes, where applicable; • were found to refer to the continuing implementation of existing decisions; or • were not relevant to the PSED and therefore did not require a stage 1 impact assessment. Three of the proposals have been impact assessed as part of this budget setting process and their impact assessments are attached (removal of school crossing patrols at light controlled crossings, increased use of personalization in Social Care services and implementation of a charge to use bus station toilets). See appendix at the end of this IA which sets out a brief summary of the findings from the screening process and contains the separate impact assessments.			

	Statutory drivers A number of statutory duties, guidance, legislation and regulations are relevant to this proposal which will be considered, these include but are not limited to: • Budget setting - Local Government Act 1972 • Individual proposals – various as set out in individual Impact Assessments • Impact Assessment process – Equality Act 2010 Differences from any previous approach The budget sets out a range of changes to services and functions as a result of financial pressures on the Council. These are outlined in the main body of the report. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) All residents of Middlesbrough and customers of MBC. Some proposals are more relevant to certain groups than others and this is set out within the individual assessments, which are also appended and the excel table. Some proposals also impact on staff. Intended outcomes To present a budget to Council that has given full consideration to the impact of proposals and gives proper consideration to the Council's equality duties.
Live date:	April 2016 onwards
Lifespan:	April 2016 – March 2017
Date of next review:	March 2017

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	A number of proposals within the 16/17 budget relate to services that have a direct and indirect impact on universal and qualified human rights, for example the proposal increase home support for young people and their families to reduce the need for residential placements. None of the proposals within the budget have been identified as having a risk of an adverse impact on human rights.
Equality						
Disability	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	Nine of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals except one either had no impact on this group, referred to decisions that had already been taken and implemented, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. Proposals potentially relevant to this group included proposals which have already been implemented and savings will be achieved by continued delivery of relevant policies and working practices: • Workforce remodelling to remove double-handling of cases • Increased use of reablement services to reduce the need for ongoing support care • Use of service providers to undertake simple reviews of individual's needs The Cessation of health related tasks proposal was a step prescribed by the Care Act as those services are identified as being required to be delivered by the NHS rather than the Council. Proposals which were subject to separate consultation and have been impact assessed as part of this budget setting process include: • Removal of school crossing patrols at light controlled crossings • Improved quality assurance in assessment and review of individuals to provide greater use of personalised care • Charge 20p for use of bus station toilets. There are no concerns that the cumulative effect of this proposals could be a disproportionate adverse impact on groups or individuals because they hold this characteristic.
Race	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	None of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. There were no concerns that any of the proposals within appendix B of the November 2015 Council report could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because of their race.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Age	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	Nine of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals except one either had no impact on this group, referred to decisions already taken, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group, had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate or would be subject to a separate assessment before a decision was taken on whether or not they should be implemented as per the process outlined in the description section. Proposals potentially relevant to this group included proposals which have already been implemented and savings will be achieved by continued delivery of relevant policies and working practices: • Increased home support for teenagers and families, reducing residential care placements • Workforce remodelling to remove double-handling of cases • Increased use of reablement services to reduce the need for ongoing support care • Use of service providers to undertake simple reviews of individual's needs The Cessation of health related tasks proposal was a step prescribed by the Care Act as those services are identified as being required to be delivered by the NHS rather than the Council. Proposals which were subject to separate consultation and have been impact assessed as part of this budget setting process include: • Removal of school crossing patrols at light controlled crossings • Improved quality assurance in assessment and review of individuals to provide greater use of personalised care • Charge 20p for use of bus station toilets. There are no concerns that the cumulative effect of this proposals could be a disproportionate adverse impact on groups or individuals because they hold this characteristic.
Religion or belief	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	None of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. There were no concerns that any of the proposals within appendix B of the November 2015 Council report could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because of their religion or belief.
Sex	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	None of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. There were no concerns that any of the proposals within appendix B of the November 2015 Council report could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because of their sex.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Pregnancy / maternity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	None of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. There were no concerns that any of the proposals within appendix B of the November 2015 Council report could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because of their pregnancy or maternity status.
Gender reassignment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	None of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. There were no concerns that any of the proposals within appendix B of the November 2015 Council report could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because of their gender status.
Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	None of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. There were no concerns that any of the proposals within appendix B of the November 2015 Council report could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because of their sexual orientation.
Marriage / civil partnership**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	None the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	A number of the proposals in relation to social care were indirectly relevant to these characteristics. These proposals either had no impact on this group, would have a positive impact on this group or will be impact assessed separately.
Criminal record / offending past**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	None the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	A number of proposals were relevant to community cohesion. Due regard was given to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to: (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding. For example the nature of the proposals to increase community based support will have positive impacts on young people, their families and people in receipt of community based support services.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	
Middlesbrough 2020						

** Indicates this is not included within the single equality duty placed upon public authorities by the Equality Act. See guidance for further details.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Theme 1 • Town that is clean, safe and healthy	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	A number of the proposals will have an impact on this theme: - Removal of school crossing patrols at light controlled crossings –impact assessment attached - Increased home support for teenagers and families, reducing residential care placements- – continued implementation of existing policy - Increased use of reablement services to reduce the need for ongoing social care support – continued implementation of existing policy - Cessation of health-related tasks – prescribed by requirements of the Care Act - Move to a leisure trust model – decision already taken.
Theme 2 • A learning town, in which families and communities thrive	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	A number of the proposals will have an impact on this theme: - School crossing patrol – impact assessment attached - Move to a leisure trust model – decision already taken - Increased home support for teenagers and families, reducing residential care placements – continued implementation of existing policy.
Theme 3 • A town that continues to transform	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	A number of the proposals will have an impact on this theme: - Move to a leisure trust model – decision already taken - Review of customer access to centralise contact points and increase online service access points – to be assessed separately.
Sustainability • One Planet Living principles • Climate Change risk assessment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	All except the proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Sustainability • One Planet Living principles • Climate Change risk assessment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Organisational management / transformation						
Partnership working	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	A number of the proposals relate to partnership working. Some of the proposals would result in the Council transfer of a function to a partner in line with their statutory duties and responsibilities or increased use of partnership / commissioning / contracting arrangements. There are no concerns expressed within this process that this could result in an unfair impact on partners.
Employees	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	A number of proposals could have a possible impact on staff. Where required, decisions already taken have been impact assessed and where there has been an impact on employees this has been considered as part of that process. Proposals which require separate impact assessment in year will consider the impact on employees, where applicable.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Accommodation	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	A number of the proposals will result in reductions in the amount of accommodation required by the Council. These proposals form part of the Council's overarching strategic approach to the management of its property. The proposals within the budget will have a positive effect on this area, streamlining council accommodation.
ICT	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No impact anticipated.

Assessment completed by:	Ann-Marie Johnstone	**Head of Service:**	Paul Slocombe
Date:	5 February 2016	**Date:**	5 February 2016

16/17 Budget proposals summary of findings

Proposal	Relevant to protected characteristic								Rationale for judgement on whether IA required as part of the budget setting process and summary of judgement if applicable
	Race	Gender	Religion / belief	Sex. Orient.	Disability	Transgender	Age	Preg/maternity	
10p increase in car parking charges and introduction of on-street car parking charge for Middlehaven.									Not applicable. Proposal is not relevant to equalities as it excludes disabled car parking which continues to be free. Decision already implemented
Removal of school crossing patrols at sites that have light controlled crossings.					x		x		The impact assessment found that the proposal is relevant to the age protected characteristics because of the nature of the service. The proposal would ensure the Council's discretionary school provision aligns with national guidance in relation to provision of school crossing patrols at light controlled crossing. Consultation feedback comprised of 4 responses concerned at the impact of removal of the patrols from Stokesley Road. Guidance identifies that the presence of a school crossing patrol and a light controlled crossing can be confusing to drivers and result in increased likelihood of accidents. Guidance that both should not be provided unless there are exceptional circumstances was considered. There is no evidence to suggest that there are exceptional circumstances which would apply to this site. Staff – the proposal will only be implemented as staff retire or leave the service.
Increase home support for teenagers and families, reducing residential care placements.							x		Not appliicable. Already implemented. Savings will be achieved by continuing to apply existing policies more effectively.
Workforce remodelling to remove double-handling of cases.					x		x		Not applicable. Already implemented. Savings will be achieved by applying existing policies more effectively.
Increased use of reablement services to reduce the need for ongoing social care support.					x		x		Not applicable. Already implemented. Savings will be achieved by applying existing policies more effectively and increasing access to reablement services.

Improved quality assurance in assessment and review of individuals to provide greater use of personalised care.					x		x		The proposal has been impact assessed as part of the development of these budget proposals and the impact assessment has been attached to the overall budget setting report. It found that the proposal would not impact on the threshold of access to services or on the level of support that is provided once the threshold is met, however they may result in changes to how services are met where there are opportunities to ensure needs continue to be met, within a different package of care, where it is appropriate to do so. There are therefore no concerns that the proposals could result in an adverse impact on current or future service users.
Closure of ASPIRE service.					x				Proposal deferred from the budget setting process at this time.
Cessation of health-related tasks.					x		x		Not applicable. Implementation of legislative requirements as prescribed by the Care Act
Use of service providers to undertake simple reviews of individuals' needs.					x		x		Not applicable. Already implemented.
Move to a Trust model for Leisure Services.									Not applicable. Decision already taken. Will be implemented from April 2016.
Redesignate the Southlands Centre as a commercially-owned and operated business centre.									Not applicable. Decision already taken.
Review of CCTV and security services.									Not applicable. Decision already taken and implemented.
Charge 20p for use of bus station toilets.					x		x		The Impact Assessment found that there were no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on groups or individuals because they held a protected characteristic because there would continue to be no charge for disabled accessible toilets and staff who are on site at all times when the bus station is open would be able to faciliate access to those toilets for those unable to access toilets otherwise because of access issues.
Review of customer access to centralise contact points and increase online service access points.					x		x		Not applicable. Savings achieved from implementation of Customer Strategy to date. There may be further proposals on customer access brought forward at a future date. These would be impact assessed, as necessary.