

Appendix 5 : Overall Budget Impact Assessment 2020/21

Subject of assessment:	Middlesbrough Council Budget 2020/21			
Coverage:	Crosscutting			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please state) Budget		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Key aims, objectives and activities</p> <p>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 2020/21 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, marriage and civil partnership, 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. The proposals for the 2020/21 budget were split into three categories when first presented to Council in December 2019:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 1: Savings proposals that are considered to have minimal or no effect on front line service delivery levels. These proposals require no, or no further public consultation or impact assessment prior to consideration by Full Council as part of the 2020/2021 revenue budget for implementation in 2020/2021 or future years. Some internal consultation may be required prior to implementation if the initiatives have a significant impact on employees, and this will be undertaken by management as appropriate. • Appendix 2: - Savings proposals considered to potentially affect front line service delivery levels. These proposals will form part of the 2020/2021 revenue budget, and were subject to the impact assessment process and consultation prior to consideration by Full Council as part of the 2020/2021 revenue budget setting process. • Appendix 3: Savings proposals requiring further development prior to being brought forward for approval. These are initiatives that will be subject to the impact assessment process (where necessary) and on which the Council will consult prior to consideration via either member or officer decision (as appropriate) either during 2020/2021 or in future years. The likely relevant decision making body and provisional timing is listed for each proposal, which may change depending on the nature of the final proposal. 			

Following this announcement, a screening assessment was completed on the proposal contained in Appendix 2 of the December 2019 report,

- Reduce spend of the drug and alcohol service provision via contract negotiations / associated budget adjustments (PHPP 01).

Two proposals included in the December 2019 report have been moved to Appendix 1 of the report as it has now been determined that they will have minimal impact on public services:

- The remaining element of Management and supervisory review of Area Care activities, with minimal impact on front line services (ECS 15).
- Review of council services which Public Health grant currently contributes to, reducing non-core PH expenditure by approximately 10% (PHPP 06).

The following proposals were removed from Appendix 2 completely and will not be proposed for approval as part of this budget:

- Reduced number of school crossing patrols across Middlesbrough, based on appropriate levels of risk assessments (REG 04).
- Revised approach from universal to targeted offer for Healthy Start Vitamins contract and decommissioning of Middlesbrough Environment City Lifestyle Choice, Focus on Nutrition and Winter Warmth contracts (PHPP 08)
- Proposal to implement a charge for the collection of green waste (ECS 18B).
- The element of the Management and supervisory review of Area Care activities proposal (ECS 15) relating to reducing the frequency of services - £90,000
- Proposal to move to fortnightly general waste collections (ECS 18A).

The proposal to increase the charges for school meals has been moved to Appendix 3 as consultation processes will not be completed in time for it to be considered as part of this budget setting report, following a delay in starting engagement with schools because of the national election. A separate report will be brought forward for consideration once consultation closes on 26 February 2020. The proposal to introduce fortnightly general waste collections has been temporarily deferred to enable a full review and assessment of how waste is collected and to allow a concentrated programme of public education and encourage recycling. As a result this has now moved from Appendix 2 to Appendix 3 of this report (savings requiring further development).

A general consultation email address was launched along with a consultation section on the Council's website, promotional posters in the hubs, bus station, Customer contact centre, other Council buildings and adverts on town centre advertising boards (known as Adshels). This resulted in receipt of 33 email responses from individuals, along with 1157 responses through the online consultation survey. Four Community meetings were offered, which were attended by approximately 80 people.

[Statutory drivers \(set out exact reference\)](#)

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.

	<p>Differences from any previous approach</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Intended outcomes</p> <p>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.</p>
Live date:	April 2020
Lifespan:	April 2020 – March 2021
Date of next review:	March 2021

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals impact on human rights. None of the assessments have identified that there could be an adverse impact on human rights as a result of a proposal.
Equality						
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>One of the proposals was subject to a separate impact assessment. The Impact Assessments (stage one and two) attached at appendix 6 identified as being potentially relevant to these protected characteristics. It identified that there could be a disproportionate adverse impact on individuals or groups because of age following completion of stage 2 impact assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Reduce spend of the drug and alcohol service provision via contract negotiations / associated budget adjustments (PHPP 01). <p>It found feedback from the budget consultation form identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal. . Those with a disability were less likely to support the proposal than those with no disability or those that chose not to provide any equality monitoring information (41% agreed, compared to 46% and 46% respectively). A small number of respondents to the budget consultation survey used the free text box to express concern about the link between mental health admissions to hospital and substance abuse. The council acknowledges this concern and this is one of the reasons the revised model has been put in place, in order to better meet the needs of those with multiple need and reduce the number that escalate to crisis intervention.</p>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
						<p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model. Given the above it is felt that the impact of that particular proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals. There were no concerns that other proposals within the budget could have a disproportionate adverse impact on individuals or groups holding these protected characteristics.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this analysis includes individual consultations, the budget consultation, feedback from community events and online engagement as well as analysis of the proposals.</p>
Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The impact assessments completed in relation to the drugs and alcohol service identified as being potentially relevant to all these protected characteristics. As detailed above, this impact assessment progressed to a level 2 impact assessment in recognition of the concern that a further reduction in the global budget for these services could have an adverse impact if the reduction was insufficient to meet expected demand. The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p>
Pregnancy / maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There were no concerns that other proposals within the budget could have a disproportionate adverse impact on individuals or groups holding these protected characteristics.</p>
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Evidence used to inform this analysis includes individual consultations, the budget consultation, feedback from community events and online engagement as well as analysis of the proposals.</p>
Criminal record / offending past**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The reduction in spend on drug and alcohol service provision was identified as having a positive impact on this group. The continued delivery of the model includes commissioning of perpetrator Domestic Violence provision which was not in place prior to October 2018.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this analysis includes individual consultations, the budget consultation, feedback from community events and online engagement as well as analysis of the proposals.</p> <p>There were no concerns that any of the other proposals being considered for decision as part of this report could impact negatively on this protected characteristic.</p>
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The impact assessment process found that the proposed reduction in spend on drug and alcohol services was relevant to community cohesion.</p> <p>The impact assessment for that proposal found that the proposal will have a positive impact on community cohesion. It will support more individuals to remain within their communities and/or successfully return to community based tenancies.</p>
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There were no concerns that any of the other proposals being considered for decision as part of this report could impact negatively on community cohesion.</p>

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Not applicable		

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

Promotion	Promotion of changes where there is an impact on service delivery will be undertaken	Individual IA leads	Various
Monitoring and evaluation	Overall monitoring of the impact will be embedded within performance management arrangements for 2020/21	Paul Stephens	May 2020

Assessment completed by:	Ann-Marie Johnstone	Head of Service:	James Bromiley, Strategic Director of Finance, Governance and Support
Date:	5 February 2020	Date:	5 February 2020