Overall Budget Impact Assessment 2023/24 Appendix 4

Subject of assessment:	Middlesbrough Council Budget 2023/24			
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 2023/24 budget proposals. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) places a statutory duty on the Council to ensure that it identifies where decisions would impact disproportionately adversely on groups that share a protected characteristic under UK law and then consider those proposals in line with the PSED. 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 identified what the impact of proposals will be. Where there is a risk that they will have a disproportionate adverse impact, consideration has been 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 if they are still brought forward, in order to comply with the PSED. This overall IA considers the overall budget process, in particular: • Appendix 2: - Savings proposals considered to potentially affect front line service delivery levels. These initiatives will form part of the 2023/2024 revenue budget and were subject to the impact assessment process and consultation prior to consideration by Full Council as part of the 2023/2024 revenue budget setting process.			

	The following proposals were removed from Appendix 2, either because they have been removed, or the way they will be achieved has been amended and so will not therefore impact on the public. Where amended, proposals were moved to Appendix 1. The impact of this is: • Redesign of Gleneagles (CC02), proposal removed • Cease providing Family Group Conferencing and incorporate workloads into social work teams (CC03), proposal removed • End Safe Families contract (CC04), moved to Appendix 1 • Reduction in Council Commissioned Youth Service Contracts by £100,000 (CC05), proposal removed. • Cease the Young Carers contract (CC09), moved to Appendix 1 • Reduce direct provision of and financial support to families to provide non-residential short breaks for children and young people with disabilities (CC 12), proposal removed • Closure of future operations of existing local authority nursery, based on appropriate levels of risk assessments (EP 03), moved to Appendix 1 • Cessation of the Welfare Rights Solution from the 1st April 2023 as part of the Budget proposal savings (FIN 06), moved to Appendix 1. A general consultation email address was launched along with a consultation section on the Council's website, promotional posters and social media promotion. This resulted in receipt of a small number of queries about the process, 2 sets of questions in relation to the youth Services provision, and a comment about the standard let's talk survey questions. There were 573 responses through the online consultation survey. One Trade Union has submitted a letter and a petition with over 350 signatures was received in relation to the Youth Services proposal. Social media promotion of the consultation is estimated to have reached up to 19,000 people on Facebook and 10 posts on twitter were viewed between 700 and 1,200 times. **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.

	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)** 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 2023 onwards
Lifespan:	April 2023 – March 2024
Date of next review:	March 2024

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).		☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	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		☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	Feedback on the impact assessments completed for the Budget Consultation identified a number of proposals as being potentially relevant to age and disability protected characteristics. The Impact Assessments (stage one and two) attached to the report identified that there could be a disproportionate adverse impact on individuals or groups because of age and disability following completion of stage 2 impact assessments: • Enhanced Youth Services (CC06) • NEET (CC10) • Hubs and Libraries (ECS14). Detail set out below: Not implementing the additional funding will impact on Young People of Middlesbrough however this will be mitigated by the removal of other planned budget cuts to Youth provision which will enable the service to continue to deliver Universal Youth Work and Transitions Youth Work. This includes a range of open access Youth Clubs sessions across different wards of Middlesbrough and social action projects which are delivered by the Youth Service Providers. The impact of the reduction in capacity in the NEET team will result in an increase in time taken for young people to be able to access timely support from suitably qualified NEET Support workers when they are at NEET, this could leave young people in situations of financial hardship and unable to access education, employment or training opportunities within the local labour market for longer until services can be accessed. This impact can be mitigated by focus of the team on

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Disability	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	statutory functions of the Local Authority, which are outlined by the Department for Education. The proposal will ensure statutory levels of service provision continue to be provided, however there will be reduced capacity in the team to deliver over and above this. In relation to Hubs and Libraries (ECS14), the proposal is to reduce the opening hours proportionately across the service to maintain a presence but with reduced number of open days (implementation plan set out in the individual impact assessment). The level 1 IA identified that the plan to reduce the days on which the My Place centre was open was relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because of the nature of the services provided there. Services on the day that it will be closed will be moved to an alternative location or moved to another day, which will mitigate the impact of the proposal on these protected characteristics. Most children and young people using the centre are already travelling to access the venue already and therefore if the location is moved, it will be to another location that is accessible by vehicles and that the facilities in the building are suitable for the needs of the children and young people, or the service delivery would be moved to another day on the same site. In line with the PSED the Council has considered whether these impacts could be avoided entirely. This is not possible because of the need to achieve a balanced budget. It then considered whether the impacts could be mitigated. It is the Council's assessment that the impact of these proposals is mitigated. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes the individual impact assessments and the consultation process.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Race	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	The individual impact assessment for this proposal raised concerns around the race protected characteristic for proposal Metz Bridge (ECS0)5. This was because the provision is targeted provision for individuals and families who identify as Gypsies and Travellers. In line with the PSED the Council has considered whether this impact could be avoided entirely. This is not possible because of the need to achieve a balanced budget. It then considered whether the impact could be mitigated. It is the Council's assessment that the impact of this proposal is partially mitigated by fact that the rent has not been raised in line with inflation in some time, however it must be acknowledged that the rental charge is higher than neighbouring authorities for similar service provision. Analysis from the responses from the 573 people and organisational representatives along with the one petition and one trade union response, it was identified that while there was overall support for the proposal. When that data was segmented by race, it showed a significant difference in support for the proposal from the BAME community. 7% overall were against the proposal, compared to 21% of those who identified as BAME of those who answered the question, although this equates to a very small number (equates to 6 people). There was also concern from a small number of individuals that the proposal could result in discrimination. Having considered proposal there are no concerns that this is the case. However, it must be acknowledged that because of the nature of the service, the make-up of the users, the proposal will only impact on those from the gypsy and traveller community. In line with the PSED, the proposal is considered to be justified because of the need to achieve a balanced budget and the length of time since the costs were last increased.
Gender reassignment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	The Council carried out impact assessments of all proposals within Appendix 2, the outcome of this was there were no concerns that any of the proposals could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on individuals or groups holding these protected characteristics.
Pregnancy / maternity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Race	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Religion or belief	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Sex	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Criminal record / offending past**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Marriage / civil partnership**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	The impact assessments for proposals Enhanced Youth Services (CC06), Neighbourhood Safety (ECS12) and Hubs and Libraries (ECS14) found that the proposals will have a negative impact on community cohesion.

** 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		
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	The concerns are Community Cohesion could be impacted by not providing enhanced Youth Services (CC06) in areas of Middlesbrough where the residents, community and businesses are experiencing high levels of anti-social behaviour. The impact of this proposal will be mitigated by the removal of the proposal to reduce the core Youth Services funding provision which will enable the service to continue to provide services and also work with existing provision to target anti-social behaviour issues, albeit without the enhanced budget. Feedback from the impact assessment for the Hubs and Libraries proposal (ECS14) raised concerns around a possible negative impact as the spaces provide community facilities for people in local communities to meet. The Hubs and Libraries proposal would be mitigated by maintaining a presence in communities by the approach that has been taken to reduce opening days across venues rather than reducing the overall number of venues available in the communities around Middlesbrough. Neighbourhood safety (ECS12) proposal identified that statutory functions would be maintained and the impact of the proposal would be partially mitigated by the use of external funding to maintain a presence in the town centre area. However, overall there will be reduced provision which could impact on community cohesion. While the Youth Services and Hub and Libraries services proposals are mitigated, it is not possible to fully mitigate the Neighbourhood Safety proposal. It is considered that the impact of this proposal on community cohesion is justified because of the need to achieve a balanced budget and ensure statutory service provision is maintained. Evidence used to inform the assessment includes analysis of the budget survey, individual engagement with current providers and users where applicable and social media engagement.

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Set out in individual impact assessments	Individual IA leads	Various

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 2023/24	A Johnstone	May 2020

Assessment completed by:	Shagufta Hussain	**Head of Service:**	Ann-Marie Johnstone
Date:	30 January 2023	**Date:**	6 February 2023

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Do not implement Council decision to extend Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	**x Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	**Review**
	Organisational change	☐ **X Other Budget Savings Proposals**		
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** On 14th February 2022 the Council Executive approved additional budget of £150,000 for the provision of Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour. These additional Youth Services to run concurrently with the existing Youth Service contracts, to ensure there is a comprehensive youth offer in Middlesbrough. The Budget Savings proposal is not to implement the Council decision to extend Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Councils have a statutory duty to "secure, so far as is reasonably practicable, sufficient provision of educational and recreational leisure-time activities for young people" and to make sure young people have a say in the local offer. This is often referred to as the 'youth services duty' (Section 507B, Education Act 1996). The decision of the Executive to provide a Youth Service Model via commissioned contracts was made in July 2020 and this relates to the Statutory Guidance for Providing Youth Services 2012 (Section 507B, Education Act 1996). On 14th February 2022, the Council Executive approved additional budget of £150,000 for the provision of Enhanced Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour. **Differences from any previous approach** The budget savings proposal is to not to allocate budget of £150,000 for the provision of Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour. These services have not yet been put in place, pending the outcome of the consultation regarding budget proposals. **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries** Beneficiaries are children and young people who would have accessed the youth sessions and detached youth work, which was planned for delivery in areas of Middlesbrough where there is identified high levels of young people related, anti-social behaviour. Key Stakeholders also include the Youth Providers who could have delivered this provision and the residents and businesses within the communities where the Targeted Youth work was to be delivered (Central, Berwick Hills and Pallister Park and Hemlington) which includes detached and outreach delivery of youth services and is focused specifically on those areas where there are concerns about exploitation of young people or there is identified anti-social behaviour which has been identified by the Neighbourhood Police or the Community Safety Teams. The additional Youth Service provision was planned to include intensive support to individual young people identified as at risk of or involved in antisocial behaviour and to the whole family including parents and siblings, predominantly pre court/ conviction. Young People of Middlesbrough will have a reduced Youth Service offer, there will be a reduction including 1-1 Youth Work interventions, small group work and detached sessions across several locations and wards. **Intended outcomes**. Not to implement the Councils decision to provide Enhanced Youth Services to make savings of £150,000.
Live date:	April 2023 onwards
Lifespan:	This is a permanent budget saving which will commence from 1st April 2023 and the Enhanced Youth Services will not be provided.
Date of next review:	Not applicable

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	The budget savings proposal will not impact on the duties performed by the service and will not impact on individual Human Rights as defined in the UK legislation. Evidence used to assess this impact includes the Statutory Guidance for Providing Youth Services 2012 (Section 507B, Education Act 1996) and feedback from the budget consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of theses broad questions prior to completion.

Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☐	☒	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. The decision not to provide additional Youth Services to make budget savings of £150,000 is relevant to the protected characteristics of 'age' which is protected by the equality duty and also those young people who are accessing Youth Services and have a disability, which is a protected characteristic. Under the proposal existing services will continue. Enhanced Youth Services is available to Young People aged 11 to 18 years. On this basis a Level 2 Impact Assessment is required as there will be a direct adverse impact on the Young People who are currently accessing these services and support if it ceases. The Council must therefore carry out a Level 2 Impact Assessment to determine if the impact of this budget saving proposal can be mitigated and if it cannot be mitigated, whether it can be justified. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on children, and is therefore

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
				relevant to the age protected characteristic. Within the survey process around 20% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 49% who opposed it.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☐	☐	☒	There are concerns that Community cohesion could be impacted by not providing enhanced Youth Services in areas of Middlesbrough where the residents, community and businesses are experiencing high levels of anti-social behaviour, which has been identified by the Neighbourhood Police and the Community Safety Teams. Without the provision of additional and enhanced Youth Services and positive activities for Young People, there could be an adverse impact on young people in terms of risk of exploitation, offending and harm outside of the home. Feedback from the budget consultation also included concern from residents about the impact the proposal could have on community safety.

Next steps:
➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Gail Earl	**Head of Service:**	*G. Earl*
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023

Impact Assessment – Regeneration Budget Savings

Subject of assessment:	Events team to reduce by 1-2 posts reducing capacity and funding to delivery Council run events such as Orange Pip Market.			
Coverage:	The saving would be specific to the service only			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	**X Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	X
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	X
Description:	**Key aims, objectives and activities** To reduce the budget for events delivery to create a saving of £148,000. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Non statutory service. **Differences from any previous approach** The budget for events in Middlesbrough is currently £148,000 which funds two members of staff and a number of events including Orange Pip and Christmas. It also allows a number of smaller, non-council events to be supported. The saving would result in reduction in internal capacity to deliver events, although this would be partially mitigated by securing external funding on a case by case basis. As a result, all Council run events would reduce, and there would be reduced capacity for the Council to support other events on Council land. External funding would be sought to provide some capacity if possible, and a sum has already been identified from an alternative external source to enable a reduced number of Orange Pip events to take place in 2023/24 if the staffing resource to manage them can be identified internally. The number of Council-run events would reduce. External funding would be sought to replace Council funding **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries** All potential event attendees and partner organisations who rely on the Council for support to host events. **Intended outcomes**. To save £148,000.			
Live date:	April 1st 2023			
Lifespan:	Permanently from April 1st 2023			
Date of next review:	None Planned			

Screening questions	**Response**			**Evidence**
	No	**Yes**	**Uncertain**	

Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	The service does not have any impact on the rights of an individual, therefore proposed savings do not adversely affect this Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. Although some events supported by the team are specific to particular identities, the Council has no formal obligations to provide or support these events. The decision would not necessarily see those events cease but would mean their production is no longer supported financially by the Council. The Council will continue to ensure an inclusive approach to future event planning. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 50% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 29% who opposed it.

Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	Although some events supported by the team are to promote community cohesion or are specific to particular identities, the Council has no formal obligations to provide or support these events. The decision would not necessarily see those events cease but would mean their production is no longer supported financially by the Council. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could adversely impact on community cohesion
There is no requirement for a full assessment at this stage				

Assessment completed by:	Richard Horniman	**Head of Service:**	N/A
Date:	26 January 2023	**Date:**	26 January 2023

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Scale Back Approved Highways Capital Investment			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☒ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☒
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☒
Description:	Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings: • **Key aims, objectives and activities** To save £162k which is based on the authority reducing its original Capital ask of £15m to £7.5m in turn reducing the cost of capital financing costs to the authority. This will be achieved through scaling back the original request for additional capital investment in Highways Infrastructure repairs and maintenance to produce the identified capital financing cost savings. • **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Statutory drivers - The Council has a duty to maintain the highway under S.41 Highways Act 1980. • **Differences from any previous approach** No differences from previous approach but a reduction in capital spend from £15m to £7.5m. • **Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)** The key stakeholders are all highway services, Residents, Members, all highway users and the Council. • **Intended outcomes.** Scaling back previously approved highways capital investment thus enabling a reduction of £162k in capital financing costs.			
Live date:	1st April 2023.			
Lifespan:	From 1st April 2023 onwards.			
Date of next review:	N/A			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision. Annual report and feedback from the budget consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:- • eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: • removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. There are no concerns that the proposal could impact differently on these individuals because they hold this protected characteristic. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 13% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 62% who opposed it.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	Not applicable. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an impact on community cohesion. There is no evidence to indicate that service users and / or the wider community have any concerns about the impact of the proposals on community cohesion. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes feedback from the budget consultation and additional engagement undertaken by the service which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could impact negatively on this section.

Next steps:
➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Chris Bates	**Head of Service:**	Chris Bates
Date:	26 January 2023	**Date:**	26 January 2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

<table>
<tr><td>Subject of assessment:</td><td colspan="4">Reduce opening hours of hubs in line with demand, and introduce self-serve at Rainbow and Neptune libraries, and reduce opening hours of other libraries in line with demand. Also delete vacant posts and reduce expenditure on supplies and services in Libraries and Hubs</td></tr>
<tr><td>Coverage:</td><td colspan="4">Service specific</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">This is a decision relating to:</td><td>☐ Strategy</td><td>☐ Policy</td><td>☐ Service</td><td>☒ Function</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Process/procedure</td><td>☐ Programme</td><td>☐ Project</td><td>☒ Review</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Organisational change</td><td colspan="3">☒ Other (please state) Budget</td></tr>
<tr><td>It is a:</td><td>New approach:</td><td>☐</td><td>Revision of an existing approach:</td><td>☒</td></tr>
<tr><td>It is driven by:</td><td>Legislation:</td><td>☐</td><td>Local or corporate requirements:</td><td>☐</td></tr>
<tr><td>Description:</td><td colspan="4"><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u>
In order to achieve a balanced budget the aim is to reduce opening hours of hubs and libraries in order to reduce staffing costs. This will mean that the community will not have access to these facilities as often as they currently do however this approach will prevent the need to close any of the venues entirely.
It is proposed that alternatives are explored for keeping the buildings open working with the community and organisations that use the buildings for community activity.
<u>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</u>
Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 - Statutory duty to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service
<u>Differences from any previous approach</u>
Each venue will close for one extra day to avoid the need to close any of them entirely. The venues within scope open for a variety of times already, the individual impact will therefore be:
- Central – current opening = 6 days – revised opening = 5 days
- Acklam – current = 4.5 days – revised opening = 4 days
- Thorntree – current opening = 5 days – revised opening = 4 days
- Marton – current opening = 3.5 days – revised opening = 3 days
- Newport – current opening = 5 days – revised opening = 4 days
- North Ormesby– current opening = 5.5 days – revised opening = 4.5
- Easterside – current opening = 5 days revised opening = 4 days
- Grove Hill – current opening = 5 days – revised opening = 4 days
- Hemlington – current opening = 3.5 days revised opening = 3 days
- MyPlace – current opening = 5 days revised opening = 4 days
- Rainbow – current opening = 4.5 days revised opening as self-serve only = 4.5
- Neptune – current opening = 4 days revised opening as self-serve only = 4
- Mobile Provision – currently operating 5 days revised opening = 4 days

2 venues, Neptune and Rainbow Centre libraries will become library self-serve only.</td></tr>
</table>

	<u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</u> All Elected Members who represent their constituents. Residents of Middlesbrough, multiple external partners that use the buildings, community and voluntary groups **<u>Intended outcomes.</u>** To achieve a balanced budget
Live date:	April 2023 onwards
Lifespan:	NA
Date of next review:	NA

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	Whilst the service will be reduced, there will still be a service. It is not anticipated that the proposal will impact on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes feedback from the budget consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of theses broad questions prior to completion.

Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☐	☒	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. All venues will remain open however there will be reduced access to them due to reduced opening hours. **Staff impact** To deliver the saving a service review will be undertaken to reduce the volume of staffing on the sites in line with the reduced opening hours. There are 58 staff in scope and a separate service review will be undertaken to implement the decision to ensure the proposal is implemented fairly, should this proposal be approved by Council. This will be subject to a further impact assessment. **Public impact** Analysis of the proposal has identified that it is relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because of the My Place facility which is in scope. My place delivers services to children and young people, most of whom are also accessing the services because they have a disability as defined by the Equality Act. The impact will be reduced access to services that are available from within the hubs and accessing the activities that are delivered from these sites. The impact will be mitigated by moving activities to dates that the service is open where is possible, moving sites, delivering

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
				services in an alternative way where the building is not open to the public and looking at alternative delivery models for services delivered from the building. In relation to My Place the proposal is to reduce the opening hours to 4 days from 5. Services on the day that will be closed will be moved to an alternative location or moved to another day, which will mitigate the impact of the proposal on these protected characteristics.
				Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 42% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 32% who opposed it.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☐	☒	☐	The proposal is relevant to this theme as it provides community facilities for people in local communities to meet in public spaces. This will be mitigated by maintaining a presence in communities by the approach that has been taken to reduce across venues rather than reducing the overall number of venues available in the communities around Middlesbrough. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes feedback from the budget consultation and additional engagement undertaken by the service which found that there were concerns expressed by some as to the impact of this proposal on their ability to access local services and resources. This impact has been mitigated as part of the proposal development by ensuring assets remain in place, although access is reduced by the reduction in opening hours, rather than closing some sites completely.

Next steps:
➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Marion Walker	**Head of Service:**	Marion Walker
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Do not implement Council decision to pilot Locality Officer in Hemlington			
Coverage:	Hemlington Ward			
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** In order to achieve a balanced budget the aim is to remove the vacant locality working officer post. This post would have acted as a coordinator of activity overseeing action plans and partnership working in Hemlington. The locality hub will still remain in operation. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** This is not a statutory service. **Differences from any previous approach** This post was never implemented in Hemlington and the activity is being undertaken by existing resources. **Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)** Hemlington Elected Members who represent their constituents. Residents of Middlesbrough, Police, fire, TEWV, YOS that use the buildings, community and voluntary groups. **Intended outcomes.** To achieve a balanced budget			
Live date:	April 2023			
Lifespan:	NA			
Date of next review:	NA			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	This post was never implemented in Hemlington and the activity is being undertaken by existing resources. It will therefore not impact on this Annual report and feedback from the budget consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of theses broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. This post was never implemented in Hemlington and the activity is being undertaken by existing resources. It will therefore not impact on this. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition, one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 32% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 29% who opposed it.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	This post was never implemented in Hemlington and the activity is being undertaken by existing resources. It will therefore not impact on this Evidence used to inform this assessment includes feedback from the budget consultation and additional engagement undertaken by the service which found that there were no concerns about community cohesion although there were concerns about anti-social behaviour.

Next steps:
➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Marion Walker	**Head of Service:**	Marion Walker
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023

Impact Assessment – Regeneration Budget Savings

Subject of assessment:	Move to digital only production of Love Middlesbrough magazine			
Coverage:	The saving would be specific to the service only			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	**X Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	X
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	X
Description:	**Key aims, objectives and activities** To reduce the cost of the Love Middlesbrough magazine while still maintaining communications with residents. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Non statutory service. **Differences from any previous approach** The current approach is provision of a digital and a home delivered copy. Under the proposal delivery will move to a digital only model. **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries** All households of Middlesbrough and others who read the magazine online. **Intended outcomes**. To reduce the cost of this magazine.			
Live date:	April 1st 2023			
Lifespan:	Permanently from April 1st 2023			
Date of next review:	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	The magazine does not impact upon the human rights of individuals and therefore the saving would not adversely affect this. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. The proposal is relevant to the disability and age protected characteristics. Although the magazine can be used to highlight the issues experienced by specific groups or individuals, it will still be produced and available electronically. We are not aware of the physical magazine being utilised to support people with specific characteristics (e.g. disabilities) but would seek to mitigate this if identified. Digital provision would meet accessibility standards to support those who use support tools to access information and services online. It is possible that the decision would reinforce digital exclusion, particularly among the elderly but the provision of computers in libraries and other premises mitigate this to a degree. As access to the internet through mobile devices in Middlesbrough is high, and other forums / routes are generally used to promote the information contained within Love Middlesbrough, access should still be achievable for most people. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations, feedback from the consultation process information on smart phone coverage in the town. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
				relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics, although some concerns were expressed about perceived digital access, however studies have shown that there is widespread digital access in the town, and the Council has also provided additional support programmes to those elderly individuals where they identify digital access support needs. Within the survey process around 76% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 10% who opposed it.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	The service does not have any impact on the particular communities, so proposed savings do not affect any community in particular. Provision of digital copy in an accessible format will ensure those who need to use translation tools are able to still access the information. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could impact on this area.

Assessment completed by:	Richard Horniman	**Head of Service:**	N/A
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Metz Bridge Traveller Site 10% Inflation increase for 2023-24			
Coverage:	Service-specific.			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☐ **Service**	☒ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
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** Apply a 10% increase to current rental charges to tenants of Metz Bridge Traveller Site. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** The Council does not have a statutory duty to provide a site for the Travelling Community to use as a temporary facility. Under the terms of the tenancy agreement (Pitch Agreement Under the Mobile Homes Act 1983). All pitched at the site are permanent which provide tenants with additional protect including a requirement to provide notice on increases to rent & Service Charges. Further guidance - Shelter Legal England - Gypsies and travellers protection from eviction - Shelter England **Differences from any previous approach** This will be the first rental increase in at least 4 years and the approach will allow for the existing rental charge to be increased to reflect the associated costs with running the service and work out as a 2.5 average increase on the four years no increase has been applied. Future increases will be undertaken through the agreed annual review of rental charges and an increase in line with inflation as per the PAUMH Act 1983. **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries'** Key stakeholders are Tenants on Metz Bridge Site, the wider Traveller Community should they wish to apply for plot and Middlesbrough Council The intended beneficiary will be Middlesbrough Council who will receive rental income and utilities income which is in line with inflation. **Intended outcomes**. The intended outcome is for rental and utilities income to be in increased by 10%.			
Live date:	April 1st, 2023 onwards			
Lifespan:	Ongoing until service monitoring identifies the need for a further review.			
Date of next review:	The impacts on the Changes will be reviewed within 12 months to ensure the intended budget savings have been met			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	The proposed increase in rental charge will not impact on individual Human Rights as defined in the UK legislation. Tenants are protected by the 'Pitch Agreement Under the Mobile Homes Act 1983'. There is no evidence to indicate that the residents or the wider community have any concerns about the impact of the proposals on community cohesion. However, the requirements under the Tenancy agreement requires 28 days consultation on the annual proposal to increase rent charges and if there are any community cohesion concerns identified within that process, this will be considered within a stage 2 impact assessment. Evidence used to inform the assessment includes feedback from the budget consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of theses broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☐	☒	☐	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:- • eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: • removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic. • taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. Because of the nature of the provision, the proposal has been identified as being particularly relevant to the race protected characteristic. **Service users** – There are currently 44 residents living on the site, this is made up from single occupiers to family units. At this stage the anticipated impact on this group is that identified needs can continue to be fully met, through the conditions of the Pitch Agreement Under the Mobile Homes Act 1983'. The decision to increase the rent in line with inflation this year comes after a number of years without an inflationary increase, therefore there are no concerns that this proposal could be unfair on this group, however because the service is provided for this one group, by its very nature it will result in an adverse impact on that group, not experienced by another group with a protected characteristic. As a result a stage two impact assessment will be completed to assess whether that impact can avoided. If it cannot, can it be mitigated and ultimately can it be justified if those steps are not possible. **Staff –** No effect on Staff

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
				Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified that while there was overall support for the proposal. when that data was segmented by race, it showed a significant difference in support for the proposal from the BAME community, however it should be noted that there can be limited judgement drawn from this. The 21% opposed relates to 6 people. - Overall, around 75% were in favour - Overall, 7% were against - 21% of BAME respondents were against the proposal - 69% of BAME respondents were in favour. There was also concern from a small number of individuals that the proposal could result in discrimination. As a result of the above, a level 2 impact assessment will be completed.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	The decision to increase the rent under the terms of the agreement at Metz Bridge traveller site does not impact negatively on relationships between different groups as it only impacts residents of Metz Bridge who have a tenancy agreement with Middlesbrough Council. Evidence used to perform the completion of this assessment to understand the impact of this proposal includes references from the Shelter Web site and copy of the Middlesbrough Council Pitch agreement. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes feedback from the budget consultation and additional engagement undertaken by the service which found that there were no concerns expressed in relation to community cohesion as a result of the proposal.

Next steps:

➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.

➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Victoria Sturdy	**Head of Service:**	David Jamison
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Reduce provision of services delivered by Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) Team to the statutory minimum			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	**x Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	**x Review**
	Organisational change	☐ **X Other Budget Savings Proposals**		
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** The NEET Team fulfils a range of statutory duties which are set out in the Department for Education Statutory Guidance in delivery of education and training provision for young people (16- and 17-year-olds). The legislation that this guidance relates to is sections 18 and 68(4) of the Education and Skills Act 2008 (ESA 2008) in relation to sections 10, 12 and 68 of that Act. This guidance is for all local authorities in England. It sets out guidance to LA staff responsible for promoting participation of young people and tracking and supporting young people's activity. Tracking young people's participation is a key element of these duties. Local authorities are required to collect information about young people so that those who are not participating, or are NEET, can be identified and given support to re-engage. Robust tracking also provides the local authority with information that will help to ensure that suitable education and training provision is available and that resources can be targeted effectively. In addition, ESA 2008 places two duties on local authorities with regard to 16- and 17-year-olds: Local authorities must promote the effective participation in education and training of 16 and 17 year olds in their area with a view to ensuring that those persons fulfil the duty to participate in education or training. A key element of this is identifying the young people in their area who are covered by the duty to participate and encouraging them to find a suitable education or training place. Local authorities must make arrangements – i.e. maintain a tracking system - to identify 16 and 17 year olds who are not participating in education or training, putting in place robust arrangements to identify young people who are not engaged in education or training or who have left provision. The Department for Education monitors the performance of all LAs in delivering these duties, specifically in tracking and supporting 16- and 17-year-olds using data submitted to the National Client Caseload Information System (NCCIS) on a monthly basis. MBC is also required to collect information about young people, so that those who are not participating or are NEET can be identified and given support to re-engage. Middlesbrough performance is tracked by the Department for Education against statistical neighbours, north east and national averages. The budget savings proposal is that the Council continues to deliver its statutory duties in relation to NEET with a reduced staff team and a reduced cost envelop. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** The NEET Team fulfil a range of statutory duties which are set out in the Department for Education Statutory Guidance Participation of young people: education, employment and training - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). This statutory guidance is for local authority staff involved in the commissioning and delivery of education and training provision for young people (16- and 17-year-olds), LA staff responsible for promoting participation of young people, and tracking and supporting young people's activity. LAs must follow this guidance when carrying out duties relating to raising the participation age and promoting participation of vulnerable young people not in education, employment or training (NEET). Statutory guidance sets out what local authorities must do to comply with the law and states that LAs should follow the guidance unless there is a very good reason not to. **Differences from any previous approach** The budget savings proposal is to reduce the capacity of the NEET team to make savings of £54k. This will result in the loss of 2 x SNEET Support Worker posts. These posts are responsible for the tracking and follow up participation duties set out in the statutory guidance and will reduce the teams NEET Support Workers from 3 posts to 1 post. **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries** Beneficiaries are the young people aged 16 and 17 years old, who access support from the NEET Team for support with education, employment opportunities. Other beneficiaries include parents and carers of these young people and external stakeholders. These include - the Department for Education and external training providers, colleges and employers who offer opportunities to young people and recruit young people.

	<u>Intended outcomes</u>. Reduce provision of services delivered by Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) Team.
Live date:	1st April 2023.
Lifespan:	This will be a permanent reduction in the NEET Team
Date of next review:	To be reviewed on 30th April to ensure that required savings have been met.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	The budget savings proposal will not impact on individual Human Rights as defined in the UK legislation. Evidence used to assess this impact includes the Statutory Guidance from the Department for Education and feedback from the budget consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of theses broad questions prior to completion.

Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☐	☒	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. The decision to reduce the NEET Team to make budget savings of £54,000 could result in an adverse impact on those who have protected characteristics of 'age' which is protected by the equality duty. If Young People do not access timely support from suitably qualified NEET Support Workers when they are NEET, this could leave young people in situations of financial hardship and unable to access education, employment or training opportunities within the local labour market. This could also impact on their future career progression and life chances. As a result of this potential adverse impact on young people, the Council will be required to complete a Level 2 Equality Impact Assessment to mitigate the potential adverse impact of the budget savings proposal.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
				The team work with Young People age 16 and 17 years who are vulnerable due to NEET and the Act includes specific protections against age discrimination in the provision of services. Evidence used to assess this impact includes the NCCIS NEET Data and the Participation of young people in education, employment or training Statutory Guidance for local authorities.
				Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition, one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified concerns at the impact of the proposal on young people. A small number of individuals expressed concern at the impact on mental health of young people which would be relevant to the disability protected characteristic. Within the survey process around 31% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 31% who opposed it. Analysis of the responses by age show that those who are young (0 -34) are much more likely to oppose this proposal than those who are older. When analysed disability, those with a disability were much more likely to oppose the proposal than those who said they had no disability although it must be noted that numbers of those with a disability responding are relatively small which may skew the data. Given the above, a stage 2 impact assessment will be undertaken to assess the differential impact of this age targeted service and consider whether it can be avoided, if not avoided if it can be mitigated and if not mitigated whether it could be justified.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	Evidence used to inform this assessment includes feedback from the budget consultation and additional engagement undertaken by the service which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could impact negatively on community cohesion. Under the proposal young people would still be in receipt of statutory services to ensure they are in education, training or employment.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Next steps: ➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.				

Assessment completed by:	Gail Earl	**Head of Service:**	*G. Earl*
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/2/2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Reduce Council expenditure on Neighbourhood Safety and seek to maximise grant funding			
Coverage:	Service specific			
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:	**<u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u>** In order to achieve a balanced budget the aim is to significantly reduce staffing in Community Safety Neighbourhood Safety Wardens team would be reduced significantly with only priority areas receiving a service Wider community safety team staffing would also be reduced i.e. NSOs. **<u>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</u>** The team deliver a number of statutory functions. The team contribute towards compliance with a range of acts including Environmental Protection Act 1990, Housing Acts, Environment Act 1995. Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act, Crime and Disorder Act, Policing Act, Dog control related legislation, Public Health legislation, Traffic Management legislation. **<u>Differences from any previous approach</u>** There are currently: • 35 Neighbourhood Safety warden posts, with 16 vacant posts. • 7 Neighbourhood Safety officer posts, no vacancies • 9 Environmental Neighbourhood Safety warden posts, no vacancies in this group. • 6 environmental operatives that sit within the team. there are currently 52 posts, if agreed the proposal would be reduced by around 60%. The impact of the proposal will be partially mitigated by the inclusion of an alternative funding source for town centre-based warden activity. **<u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</u>** All Elected Members who represent their constituents. Residents of Middlesbrough Cleveland Police, Cleveland Fire Service, Probation, Health, PCC, Voluntary and community sector. **<u>Intended outcomes.</u>** To reduce the cost of delivery of the service by ceasing the non-statutory elements of the service.			
Live date:	April 2023 onwards, subject to staff consultation			
Lifespan:	April 2023 onwards			
Date of next review:	NA			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	Whilst the service will be reduced, there will still be a service. It is not anticipated that the proposal will impact on human rights. Annual report and feedback from the budget consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of theses broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. **Staff impact** Significantly reducing the service will mean that some areas do not have wardens within their wards. There are currently: • 35 Neighbourhood Safety warden posts, with 16 vacant posts. • 7 Neighbourhood Safety officer posts, no vacancies • 9 Environmental Neighbourhood Safety warden posts, no vacancies in this group. • 6 environmental operatives that sit within the team. There are currently 52 posts, if agreed the proposal would be reduced by around 60%. The impact of the proposal will be partially mitigated by the inclusion of an alternative funding source for town centre-based warden activity. A service review will be undertaken to deliver the required savings and ensure that the impact on staff is fair, this will be subject to a further impact assessment. The policies which govern this process have also been impact assessed.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
				Public impact It is likely that the Town Centre will take priority. If implemented, the non-statutory elements of the service will be removed. The service will reduce by 60%, although that will be mitigated somewhat by alternative funding that has been identified for the town centre. The impact on the public will be reduced warden presence and support. Longer response times and the team will be less able to tackle nuisance issues / anti-social behaviour. There will also be a reduced capacity to pursue civil injunctions, house closures and fly tipping prosecutions. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 31% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 44% who opposed it.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☐	☐	☒	Reduction in the service to focus on statutory elements only. The service will focus on Town Centre area which will enable it to continue to support positive community cohesion within the town centre, there will however be a reduced ability to replicate this approach in other communities in the town if they experience anti-social behaviour which impacts on community relations between communities of interest and in neighbourhoods. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes feedback from the budget consultation and additional engagement undertaken by the service which found that there were overall concerns about reduced neighbourhood safety with 31% of those who disagreed with the proposal identifying it as a concern.

Next steps:
➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Marion Walker	**Head of Service:**	Marion Walker
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Street Lighting; approx.1 in 2 lights turned off between midnight and 6am, in less used spaces and intermittently in other appropriate spaces where safe to do so (will not affect road junctions and major roads)			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☒ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☒
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☒
Description:	Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings: • **Key aims, objectives and activities** Reduction of Energy consumption, in-turn reducing the authority's energy bill which would equate to a revenue saving of £74k/year for budget years 2023/24 and 2024/25 (overall saving of £148k). This will be achieved through the Installation of new photocells to approximately 9000 street lighting columns to enable them to be turned off between midnight and 6am. Exception criteria has been developed to ensure that the columns which will be the subject of part night lighting will be in less used spaces and intermittently in other appropriate spaces where safe to do so. • **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Statutory drivers - S.97 of the Highways Act 1980 provides Highway Authorities with the power to provide street lighting but there are no statutory requirements to do so. • **Differences from any previous approach** All street lights are currently lit from dusk till dawn. • **Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)** The key stakeholders are Highways Services, Residents, Members, all highway users and the Council. • **Intended outcomes.** Reduction in energy costs with associated reduction in carbon footprint and reduction in light pollution while maintaining safety of users. In turn saving £74k/year for 2023/24 and 2024/25 (total £148k) which is identified as a saving within the Councils Budget Saving programme.			
Live date:	1st April 2023 onwards			
Lifespan:	From 1st April 2023 onwards.			
Date of next review:	None planned			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	The service does not have any impact on the rights of an individual, therefore proposed savings do not adversely affect this Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:- • eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: • removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. There are no concerns that the proposal could impact differently on these individuals because they hold one of the protected characteristics. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 61% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 24% who opposed it.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	Not applicable. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an impact on community cohesion. There is no evidence to indicate that service users and / or the wider community have any concerns about the impact of the proposals on community cohesion. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could adversely impact on community cohesion.

Next steps:

➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.

➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Chris Bates	**Head of Service:**	Chris Bates
Date:	26th January 2023	**Date:**	26th January 2023

Impact Assessment – Regeneration Budget Savings

Subject of assessment:	Introduce £1 charge to replace 3 hrs Free Parking at Captain Cook Car Park			
Coverage:	The change would be specific to the service only			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	**X Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	X
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	X
Description:	**Key aims, objectives and activities** To increase parking revenue by replacing the current free offer with a charge of £1. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Road traffic Regulation Act 1984 gives the council the power to designate and control off street parking **Differences from any previous approach** The existing offer of 3 hours free parking at Captain Cook Square is funded by a grant from the Tees Valley Combined Authority (TVCA) that is due to end. Rather than extend the offer using Council resources, a £1 charge will be introduced to replace the offer. This will still be less than the charges on other Council owned car parks and is aimed at shoppers visiting the town centre. The change is expected to generate £200k pa in additional income. **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries** Users of the Captain Cook Car Park, businesses within the centre. **Intended outcomes**. To raise revenue income to mitigate the need for financial savings.			
Live date:	April 1st 2023 onwards			
Lifespan:	Permanently from April 1st 2023			
Date of next review:	The impacts on the Changes will be reviewed within 12 months to ensure the intended budget savings have been met			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	The pricing of car parks does not have any impact on the rights of an individual, therefore proposed savings do not adversely affect this Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process which found that no concerns in relation to human rights.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. The price of car parking does not have any impact on particular groups or individuals, so the proposed increase will not affect any groups or individuals in particular. Adjustments continue to be in place for those with the disability characteristic, where they meet the threshold for access to a blue badge. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 63% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 19% who opposed it.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	The price of car parking does not have any impact on particular communities, so the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could adversely impact on community cohesion
There is no requirement for a full assessment at this stage				

Assessment completed by:	Richard Horniman	**Head of Service:**	N/A
Date:	26th January 2023	**Date:**	26th January 2023

Impact Assessment – Regeneration Budget Savings

Subject of assessment:	New Model for Parks Management			
Coverage:	The saving would be specific to the service only			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	**X Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	X
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	X
Description:	**Key aims, objectives and activities** To reduce the cost of providing the Parks Service by £44,000 pa. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Non statutory service. **Differences from any previous approach** This would be achieved by deleting 2-3 vacant posts. The Parks Team would be reshaped to operate on more of a touring basis, visiting parks on a rota rather than having fixed hours of coverage for each park. The capacity to provide support to events in the parks would also be reduced proportionately. **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries** All park users or event attendees. **Intended outcomes**. To reduce the cost of delivering the service.			
Live date:	April 1st 2023 onwards			
Lifespan:	Permanently from April 1st 2023			
Date of next review:	None Planned			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	The service does not have any impact on the rights of an individual, therefore proposed savings do not adversely affect this Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. As the parks are a town-wide resource, the service does not have any impact on particular groups or individuals, so the proposed savings do not affect any disproportionately. The parks would still remain open, so the opportunity to enjoy them is not being removed. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 35% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 28% who opposed it.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	As the parks are a town-wide resource, the service does not have any impact on particular communities, so the proposed savings do not affect any community disproportionately. The parks would still remain open, so the opportunity to enjoy them is not being removed. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could adversely impact on community cohesion.
There is no requirement for a full assessment at this stage				

Assessment completed by:	Richard Horniman	**Head of Service:**	N/A
Date:	26th January 2023	**Date:**	26th January 2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Do not implement Council decision to provide Pest Control Services			
Coverage:	Service specific			
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:	**<u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u>** In order to achieve a balanced budget the aim is to reverse the decision relating to the allocation of £90,000 at the Full Council meeting held on 23rd February 2022 specifically for a subsidised residential pest control service. This service would have: • Provided an affordable residential pest control service for members of the public whilst also being sustainable in terms of future delivery. • Seen the introduction of an operational team to implement the service that would have seen a subsidised fee set at £15 per visit (in line with other Local Authority charging and approx. 50% less than private sector.) **<u>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</u>** This is not a statutory service. **<u>Differences from any previous approach</u>** Middlesbrough Council do not currently offer a residential pest control service however they did in 2017/18 and the charging fee is set at the same level. The Council do offer a commercial pest control service and this will continue to run separately to the residential service provision. **<u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</u>** All Elected Members who represent their constituents. Residents of Middlesbrough (Excluding Thirteen tenants who already offer a residential pest control service **<u>Intended outcomes.</u>** To achieve a balanced budget			
Live date:	April 1st 2023 onwards			
Lifespan:	NA			
Date of next review:	None planned			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	We do not currently deliver a service so reversing this decision will not impact no have an impact on Human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of theses broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to: • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. • Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to: • remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; • encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. We do not currently deliver a service so reversing this decision will not impact nor have an impact on the protected characteristics. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 37% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 35% who opposed it.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	We do not currently deliver a service so reversing this decision will not impact nor have an impact on Community Cohesion. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could adversely impact on community cohesion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Next steps: ➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.				

Assessment completed by:	Marion Walker	**Head of Service:**	Marion Walker
Date:	26th January 2023	**Date:**	26th January 2023

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	School Catering increase in primary school meal prices from £2.15 to £2.40 and secondary school meal prices from £2.25 to £2.50 in line with inflation			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☒ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☒ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
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** To assess the proposal to increase the price at which we will offer the provision of meals to schools. • **Statutory drivers** Provision of a Council school meals catering service is discretionary, schools could choose to source them from another provider. • **Differences from any previous approach** Present pricing structure is **£2.15 for Primary** and **£2.25 for secondary**. In order to cover costs, prices are increasing to **£2.40 for primary** school meals and **£2.50 for secondary schools**. Schools are able to choose to deliver this service themselves or seek another provider. They are not mandated to take the Council service and are free to commission whoever they choose to deliver this service, indeed a number of schools have moved to an alternative provider in the last 12 months. • **Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)** Users of these services are children. • **Intended outcomes.** That the service is able to continue to deliver within a cost neutral approach to the Council.			
Live date:	April 1st 2023 onwards			
Lifespan:	Ongoing until service monitoring identifies the need for a further review.			
Date of next review:	The impacts on the Changes will be reviewed within 12 months to ensure the intended budget savings have been met			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *	☒	☐	☐	Increasing the cost of school meals does not have any impact on the rights of an individual, therefore proposed savings do not adversely affect this. Evidence to support this position includes, knowledge of the market, ability of schools to commission elsewhere and protections in place through free school meals provision for those who qualify.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *	☒	☐	☐	The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to: (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: • removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. Because of the nature of the service it is relevant to the age protected characteristic. However there are no concerns that there could a disproportionate adverse impact on this group as a result of changes to the charges for this commercial service. Evidence to support this position includes, knowledge of the market, ability of schools to commission elsewhere and protections in place through free school meals provision for those who qualify. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 46% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 36% who opposed it.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *	☒	☐	☐	Not directly relevant to decision. There are no concerns the proposals could impact on community cohesion. The proposal will ensure the Council's approach to provision of services continues to be sustainable. Schools are free to commission this service from other providers. Evidence to support this position includes, knowledge of the market, ability of schools to commission elsewhere and protections in place through free school meals provision for those who qualify. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could adversely impact on community cohesion.

Next steps:

➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.

➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.

Assessment completed by:	Andy Mace	**Head of Service:**	Andy Mace
Date:	26th January 2023	**Date:**	26th January 2023

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Proposal to not implement the Council decision to provide additional tree maintenance service			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☒ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☒ **Review**
	☒ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☒
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☒
Description:	Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings: • **Key aims, objectives and activities** Reversal of the decision to re-establish in-house Arboriculture team. To support this there will be minor amendments to the current Tree Policy. A separate impact assessment will be carried out to reflect this. • **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Local Government Act 1976. Occupiers Liability Act 1957/1984. Highways Act 1980. As the land owner, Middlesbrough Borough Council has a statutory obligation to inspect and manage its tree stock. • **Differences from any previous approach** The reintroduction of an in-house Arboricultural team would increase our ability to react and remove unnecessary delays to the processes. In turn removing elements of unnecessary frustration to all concerned. Reviewing the Tree Policy will give the Arboricultural Officer and Team to have more autonomy in relation to responses given and hopefully come to more amicable solutions rather than rigidly adhering to the current document • **Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)** The key stakeholders are Environmental Services, Residents and Members. • **Intended outcomes.** To establish the in-house Arboricultural Team, which will result in Tree issues being managed in a more efficient/cost effective way. Additionally, the Tree exposure risks will reduce due to an increase in the Tree Inspection frequencies.			
Live date:	April 1st 2023 onwards.			
Lifespan:	April 2022 onwards.			
Date of next review:	None planned.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of staff demographics, engagement to date with staff and analysis of current service provision. Feedback from the budget consultation process which found no concerns in relation to human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:- • eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: • removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an impact on individuals or groups because they hold one or more protected characteristics. The proposal will ensure the Council continues to meet its legal obligations in relation to this function. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of staff demographics, engagement to date with staff and analysis of current service provision. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 50% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 17% who opposed it.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	Not applicable. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an impact on community cohesion. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process which found that there were no concerns that the proposal could adversely impact on community cohesion.

Next steps:
➲ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
➲ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Craig Coverdale	**Head of Service:**	Andrew Mace
Date:	26th January 2023	**Date:**	26th January 2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

Subject of assessment:	Do not implement Council decision to extend Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☒ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **X Other (please state) Budget Savings Proposals**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☐ X
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☐ X

Description:	**Key aims, objectives and activities** On 14th February 2022 the Executive approved additional budget of £150,000 for the provision of Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour. These additional Youth Services to run concurrently with the existing Youth Service contracts, to ensure there is a comprehensive youth offer in Middlesbrough. The Budget Savings proposal is not to implement the Council decision to extend Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** Councils have a statutory duty to "secure, so far as is reasonably practicable, sufficient provision of educational and recreational leisure-time activities for young people" and to make sure young people have a say in the local offer. This is often referred to as the 'youth services duty' (Section 507B, Education Act 1996). The decision of the Executive to provide a Youth Service Model via commissioned contracts was made in July 2020 and this relates to the Statutory Guidance for Providing Youth Services 2012 (Section 507B, Education Act 1996). On 14th February 2022, the Council Executive approved additional budget of £150,000 for the provision of Enhanced Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour. **Differences from any previous approach** The budget savings proposal is to not to allocate budget of £150,000 for the provision of Youth Services in areas of high anti-social behaviour. These services have not yet been put in place, pending the outcome of the consultation regarding budget proposals. **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries** Beneficiaries are children and young people who would have accessed the youth sessions and detached youth work, which was planned for delivery in areas of Middlesbrough where there is identified high levels of young people related, anti-social behaviour. Key Stakeholders also include the Youth Providers who could have delivered this provision and the residents and businesses within the communities where the Targeted Youth work was to be delivered (Central, Berwick Hills and Pallister Park and Hemlington) which includes detached and outreach delivery of youth services and is focused specifically on those areas where there are concerns about exploitation of young people or there is identified anti-social behaviour which has been identified by the Neighbourhood Police or the Community Safety Teams. The additional Youth Service provision was planned to include intensive support to individual young people identified as at risk of or involved in antisocial behaviour and to the whole family including parents and siblings, predominantly pre court/ conviction. Young People of Middlesbrough will have a reduced Youth Service offer, there will be a reduction including 1-1 Youth Work interventions, small group work and detached sessions across several locations and wards. **Intended outcomes**. Not to implement the Councils decision to provide Enhanced Youth Services to make savings of £150,000.
Live date:	April 2023 onwards
Lifespan:	This is a permanent budget saving which will commence from 1st April 2023 and the Enhanced Youth Services will not be provided.
Date of next review:	Not applicable

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).	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	The proposed Enhanced Youth Services proposal was found not to impact on human rights as defined in the UK legislation. The assessment process identified that there was no adverse impact on human rights as a result of the proposal.
Equality						
Age	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	The proposal was identified as having a potential disproportionate adverse impacts on the protected characteristics because of the nature of the service that would have been provided had the additional funding been implemented. The decision not to provide additional Youth Services to make budget savings of £150,000 is relevant to the protected characteristics of 'age' which is protected by the equality duty. Under the proposal the existing Youth Service contracts will continue. If Enhanced youth services is not progressed, this will be mitigated by our existing Youth Service contract. In line with the PSED the Council has considered whether this impact could be avoided entirely. This is not possible because of the need to achieve a balanced budget. It then considered whether the impact could be mitigated. It is the Council's assessment that the impact of this proposal is mitigated by the retention of existing budgets to deliver youth services which will continue to be provided.
Disability	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	
Gender reassignment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No negative impacts identified in the level one assessment around Gender Reassignment within the Equality screening.
Pregnancy / maternity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Race	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Religion or belief	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Sex	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Marriage / civil partnership**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Criminal record / offending past**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

** 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		
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	There are concerns that Community cohesion could be impacted by not providing enhanced Youth Services in areas of Middlesbrough where the residents, community and businesses are experiencing high levels of anti-social behaviour, which has been identified by the Neighbourhood Police and the Community Safety Teams. Without the provision of additional and enhanced Youth Services and positive activities for Young People, there could be an adverse impact on young people in terms of risk of exploitation, offending and harm outside of the home. The decision could also impact negatively on individual communities or neighbourhoods or relations between communities, in terms of increased incidences of young people related anti-social behaviour. As the Enhanced Youth Services have not yet been implemented nor carried out, and existing youth budgets will be retained which will mitigate the impact by enabling the service to continue to deliver services that contribute towards diverting children away from anti-social activities.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Existing Youth Services budgets will remain.	Head of Service – Early Help. Specialist Commissioning Manager	n/a

Promotion	The decision and its impacts will be publicised both internally and externally by the Council. Other providers of provision will also be promoted.	Head of Service – Early Help. Specialist Commissioning Manager	March 2023
Monitoring and evaluation	The implementation of the decision will be monitored and evaluated by the Community Safety Team, to identify any areas of unexpected negative impact.	Head of Service – Early Help. Specialist Commissioning Manager	April 2023 – March 2024

Assessment completed by:	Gail Earl	**Head of Service:**	Head of Service Early Help and Prevention
Date:	26 January 2023	**Date:**	26 January 2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

<table>
<tr><td>Subject of assessment:</td><td colspan="4">Reduce opening hours of hubs in line with demand, and introduce self-serve at Rainbow and Neptune libraries, and reduce opening hours of other libraries in line with demand. Also delete vacant posts and reduce expenditure on supplies and services in Libraries and Hubs</td></tr>
<tr><td>Coverage:</td><td colspan="4">Service specific</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">This is a decision relating to:</td><td>☐ Strategy</td><td>☐ Policy</td><td>☐ Service</td><td>☒ Function</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Process/procedure</td><td>☐ Programme</td><td>☐ Project</td><td>☒ Review</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Organisational change</td><td>☒ Other (please state)</td><td colspan="2">Budget</td></tr>
<tr><td>It is a:</td><td>New approach:</td><td>☐</td><td>Revision of an existing approach:</td><td>☒</td></tr>
<tr><td>It is driven by:</td><td>Legislation:</td><td>☐</td><td>Local or corporate requirements:</td><td>☐</td></tr>
<tr><td>Description:</td><td colspan="4"><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u>
In order to achieve a balanced budget the aim is to reduce opening hours of hubs and libraries in order to reduce staffing costs. This will mean that the community will not have access to these facilities as often as they currently do however this approach will prevent the need to close any of the venues entirely.
It is proposed that alternatives are explored for keeping the buildings open working with the community and organisations that use the buildings for community activity.
<u>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</u>
Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 - Statutory duty to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service
<u>Differences from any previous approach</u>
Each venue will close for one extra day to avoid the need to close any of them entirely. The venues within scope open for a variety of times already, the individual impact will therefore be:
- Central – current opening = 6 days – revised opening = 5 days
- Acklam – current = 4.5 days – revised opening = 4 days
- Thorntree – current opening = 5 days – revised opening = 4 days
- Marton – current opening = 3.5 days – revised opening = 3 days
- Newport – current opening = 5 days – revised opening = 4 days
- North Ormesby– current opening = 5.5 days – revised opening = 4.5
- Easterside – current opening = 5 days revised opening = 4 days
- Grove Hill – current opening = 5 days – revised opening = 4 days
- Hemlington – current opening = 3.5 days revised opening = 3 days
- MyPlace – current opening = 5 days revised opening = 4 days
- Rainbow – current opening = 4.5 days revised opening as self-serve only = 4.5
- Neptune – current opening = 4 days revised opening as self-serve only = 4
- Mobile Provision – currently operating 5 days revised opening = 4 days

2 venues, Neptune and Rainbow Centre libraries will become library self-serve only.</td></tr>
</table>

	<u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</u> All Elected Members who represent their constituents. Residents of Middlesbrough, multiple external partners that use the buildings, community and voluntary groups **<u>Intended outcomes.</u>** To achieve a balanced budget
Live date:	April 2023 onwards
Lifespan:	NA
Date of next review:	NA

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).	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No concerns were identified at stage one in relation to this element.
Equality						
Age	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	Within the level 1 impact assessment it was identified that the proposal was particularly relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because it included within it a proposal to reduce the opening hours of targeted provision available at My place. In relation to My Place, the proposal is to reduce the opening hours to 4 days from 5 days. Services on the day that will be closed will be moved to an alternative location or moved to another day, which will mitigate the impact of the proposal on these protected characteristics. Most children and young people using the centre are already assisted to travel to the venue already and therefore if the location is moved, it will be to another location that is accessible by vehicles and that the facilities in the building are suitable for the needs of the children and young people, or the service delivery would be moved to another day on the same site. In line with the PSED the Council has considered whether this impact could be avoided entirely. This is not possible because of the need to achieve a balanced budget. It then considered whether the impact could be mitigated. It is the Council's assessment that the impact of this proposal is mitigated by the plan to retain the provision on the site and to ensure services delivered on the day it will now be closed for are either moved to an alternative day at My Place or an alternative site, whichever is the most appropriate.
Disability	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	
Gender reassignment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Pregnancy / maternity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No concerns were identified at stage one and no concerns have been raised in relation to these protected characteristics.
Race	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Religion or belief	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sex	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Marriage / civil partnership**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Criminal record / offending past**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

** 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		
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	It was identified in the level 1 impact assessment that the proposal is relevant to this theme as it provides community facilities for people in local communities to meet in public spaces. Within that level 1 IA it was identified that the proposal would be mitigated by maintaining a presence in communities by the approach that has been taken to reduce across venues rather than reducing the overall number of venues available in the communities around Middlesbrough. In line with the PSED, consideration has been given to how the proposal could be avoided. It could not be avoided because of the need to ensure the Council has a balanced budget. Consideration was then given to mitigation. The proposals have been developed in more detail during the consultation period to ensure their impact is mitigated by maintaining a presence within communities, with closure dates informed by demand levels. This has taken into account usage levels to ensure closure dates are aligned with demand. It is considered that this impact is mitigated based on: • an assessment of current usage levels • the approach which will shape the impact to reduce services when venues are less well used • staggering closures to ensure alternative locations are available within nearby locations • using alternative delivery models where possible for services delivered.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
						Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately on one or more of the protected characteristics. Within the survey process around 42% of respondents agreed with the proposal, compared to 32% who opposed it.

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Implement a revised model of delivery and opening hours that ensures continued community presence, delivery of savings with least impact on the public and service users and with a staggered approach to maintain alternative open venues nearby.	Marion Walker	September 2023
Promotion	Changes to opening hours will be promoted in individual venues on a staggered basis as they are implemented to ensure full awareness and also promote alternative sites.	Marion Walker	September 2023 and onwards
Monitoring and evaluation	Ongoing monitoring of the impact to be reviewed within the project put in place to deliver the saving.	Marion Walker	Ongoing

Assessment completed by:	Marion Walker	**Head of Service:**	Marion Walker
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

Subject of assessment:	Metz Bridge Traveller Site – Rent increase 2023/2024			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☐ **Service X**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☐
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☐x
Description:	**Key aims, objectives and activities** Apply a 10% increase to current rental charges to tenants of Metz Bridge Traveller Site. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** The Council does not have a statutory duty to provide a site for the Travelling Community to use as a temporary facility. Under the terms of the tenancy agreement (Pitch Agreement Under the Mobile Homes Act 1983). All pitched at the site are permanent which provide tenants with additional protect including a requirement to provide notice on increases to rent & Service Charges. Further guidance - Shelter Legal England - Gypsies and travellers protection from eviction - Shelter England **Differences from any previous approach** This will be the first rental increase in at least 4 years and the approach will allow for the existing rental charge to be increased to reflect the associated costs with running the service and work out as a 2.5 average increase on the four years no increase has been applied. Future increases will be undertaken through the agreed annual review of rental charges and an increase in line with inflation as per the PAUMH Act 1983. **Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries'** Key stakeholders are Tenants on Metz Bridge Site, the wider Traveller Community should they wish to apply for plot and Middlesbrough Council The intended beneficiary will be Middlesbrough Council who will receive rental income and utilities income which is in line with inflation. **Intended outcomes**. The intended outcome is for rental and utilities income to be in increased by 10%.			
Live date:	April 1st, 2023 onwards			
Lifespan:	Ongoing until service monitoring identifies the need for a further review.			
Date of next review:	The impacts on the Changes will be reviewed within 12 months to ensure the intended budget savings have been met			

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).	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No concerns were identified at stage one in relation to this element.
Equality						

Race	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	Within the level 1 impact assessment it was identified that the proposal was particularly relevant to the race protected characteristics because the provision is targeted provision for individuals and families who identify as Gypsies and Travellers. In line with the PSED the Council has considered whether this impact could be avoided entirely. This is not possible because of the need to achieve a balanced budget. It then considered whether the impact could be mitigated. It is the Council's assessment that the impact of this proposal is partially mitigated by fact that the rent has not been raised in line with inflation in some time, however it must be acknowledged that the rental charge is higher than neighbouring authorities for similar service provision. In line with the PSED, consideration was then given to whether the proposal could be justified. It is felt that the proposal is justified because of the need to achieve a balanced budget, the need to cover the costs of the provision on the site and the number of years for which an inflationary increase. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process. 573 people and organisational representatives responded to the Council's budget consultation survey. In addition one petition was submitted in relation to another proposal and one letter from a Trade Union. Analysis of those responses have identified that while there was overall support for the proposal. when that data was segmented by race, it showed a significant difference in support for the proposal from the BAME community. - Overall, around 75% were in favour - Overall, 7% were against

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
						- 21% of BAME respondents were against the proposal (though this only equates to 6 people) - 69% of BAME respondents were in favour.
						There was also concern from a small number of individuals that the proposal could result in discrimination. Having considered proposal there are no concerns that this is the case. However it must be acknowledged that because of the nature of the service, the make up of the users that the proposal will only impact on those from the gypsy and traveller community.
Disability	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No concerns were identified at stage one and no concerns have been raised in relation to these protected characteristics.
Gender reassignment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Pregnancy / maternity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Age	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Religion or belief	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sex	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Marriage / civil partnership**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Criminal record / offending past**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

** 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		
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	Gypsies and some traveller ethnicities have been recognised in law as being ethnic groups protected against discrimination by the Equality Act 2010. The proposal to increase the rent for a pitch at Metz Bridge only impacts on this community as only gypsies and travellers are eligible for a pitch at Metz Bridge. There are no concerns that the proposal will impact on relations between communities and neighbourhoods. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and its impact on those affected.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Signposting to housing benefits processes for those affected where they could be accessed by eligible individuals to mitigate impacts	David Jamison	April 2023 onwards
Promotion	Promotion of the changes to those affected.	David Jamison	April 2023 onwards
Monitoring and evaluation	Monitoring and evaluating the decision will be carried out by staff who manage Metz Bridge Traveller Site. This will be done via monitoring rental payments and reviewing arrears.	David Jamison	ongoing

Assessment completed by:	Victoria Sturdy	**Head of Service:**	David Jamison
Date:	26/01/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

Subject of assessment:	Reduce provision of services delivered by Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) Team to the statutory minimum			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☐ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **X Other (please state) Budget Savings**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☐X
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☐X

Description:	**Key aims, objectives and activities** The NEET Team fulfils a range of statutory duties which are set out in the Department for Education Statutory Guidance in delivery of education and training provision for young people (16- and 17-year-olds). The legislation that this guidance relates to is sections 18 and 68(4) of the Education and Skills Act 2008 (ESA 2008) in relation to sections 10, 12 and 68 of that Act. This guidance is for all local authorities in England. It sets out guidance to LA staff responsible for promoting participation of young people and tracking and supporting young people's activity. Tracking young people's participation is a key element of these duties. Local authorities are required to collect information about young people so that those who are not participating, or are NEET, can be identified and given support to re-engage. Robust tracking also provides the local authority with information that will help to ensure that suitable education and training provision is available and that resources can be targeted effectively. In addition, ESA 2008 places two duties on local authorities with regard to 16- and 17-year-olds: Local authorities must promote the effective participation in education and training of 16 and 17 year olds in their area with a view to ensuring that those persons fulfil the duty to participate in education or training. A key element of this is identifying the young people in their area who are covered by the duty to participate and encouraging them to find a suitable education or training place. Local authorities must make arrangements – i.e. maintain a tracking system - to identify 16 and 17 year olds who are not participating in education or training, putting in place robust arrangements to identify young people who are not engaged in education or training or who have left provision. The Department for Education monitors the performance of all LAs in delivering these duties, specifically in tracking and supporting 16- and 17-year-olds using data submitted to the National Client Caseload Information System (NCCIS) on a monthly basis. MBC is also required to collect information about young people, so that those who are not participating or are NEET can be identified and given support to re-engage. Middlesbrough performance is tracked by the Department for Education against statistical neighbours, north east and national averages. The budget savings proposal is that the Council continues to deliver its statutory duties in relation to NEET with a reduced staff team and a reduced cost envelop. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** The NEET Team fulfil a range of statutory duties which are set out in the Department for Education Statutory Guidance Participation of young people: education, employment and training - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). This statutory guidance is for local authority staff involved in the commissioning and delivery of education and training provision for young people (16- and 17-year-olds), LA staff responsible for promoting participation of young people, and tracking and supporting young people's activity. LAs must follow this guidance when carrying out duties relating to raising the participation age and promoting participation of vulnerable young people not in education, employment or training (NEET). Statutory guidance sets out what local authorities must do to comply with the law and states that LAs should follow the guidance unless there is a very good reason not to.

	Differences from any previous approach The budget savings proposal is to reduce the capacity of the NEET team to make savings of £54k. This will result in the loss of 2 x NEET Support Worker posts. These posts are responsible for the tracking and follow up participation duties set out in the statutory guidance and will reduce the teams NEET Support Workers from 3 posts to 1 post.
	Key stakeholders and Intended beneficiaries Beneficiaries are the young people aged 16 and 17 years old, who access support from the NEET Team for support with education, employment opportunities. Other beneficiaries include parents and carers of these young people and external stakeholders. These include - the Department for Education and external training providers, colleges and employers who offer opportunities to young people and recruit young people.
Live date:	1st April 2023 onwards
Lifespan:	This will be a permanent reduction in the NEET Team
Date of next review:	Not applicable

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).	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	The proposed NEET proposal was found not to impact on human rights as defined in the UK legislation. The assessment process identified that there was no adverse impact on human rights as a result of the proposal.
Equality						
Age	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Disability	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	The Level 1 impact assessment identified that the proposal was relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because the service is age targeted and also because of concerns expressed by a small number of respondents who were concerned that the mental health impacts of reduced service provision on young people's mental health. The NEET Team will be reduced to make budget savings of £54,000 the proposal will reduce capacity, resulting in longer times for young people to wait to access support from suitably qualified NEET Support Workers when they are NEET, this could leave young people in situations of financial hardship and unable to access education, employment or training opportunities within the local labour market for longer until they are able to access support. This could also impact on their future career progression and life chances. This impact can be mitigated by focus of the team on statutory functions of the Local Authority, which are outlined by the Department for Education. The proposal will ensure statutory levels of service provision continue to be provided, however there will be reduced capacity in the team to deliver over and above this. In line with the PSED the Council has considered whether this impact could be avoided entirely. This is not possible because of the need to achieve a balanced budget. It then considered whether the impact could be mitigated. It is the Council's assessment that the impact of this proposal is mitigated by the retention of the team to provide statutory levels of service delivery. This will mitigate the impact of the proposal by ensuring that statutory duties continue to be met.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Gender reassignment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No negative impacts identified in the level one assessment around these protected characteristics.
Pregnancy / maternity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Race	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Religion or belief	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sex	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Marriage / civil partnership**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Criminal record / offending past**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

** 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		
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	There were no concerns identified in the level one assessment that the proposal could impact negatively on community cohesion.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	• This impact can be mitigated by focus of the team on statutory functions of the Local Authority, which are outlined by the Department for Education • The NEET Team will be refocussed to ensure that all Statutory duties are met by the Local Authority. • The NEET Team will be closely aligned with the role and functions of the Community Learning Service to increase partnership working and improve outcomes for children and young people.	Head of Service – Early Help.	March 2023
Promotion	Not applicable.	-	-
Monitoring and evaluation	The implementation of the decision will be monitored and evaluated through the monitoring of statutory Department for Education data returns and outcomes. This includes measures linked to NEET, NOT Known, Annual Activity Survey and September Guarantee.	Head of Service – Early Help	March 2024

Assessment completed by:	Gail Earl	**Head of Service:**	Head of Service Early Help and Prevention
Date:	26 January 2023	**Date:**	26 January 2023

Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

Subject of assessment:	Reduce Council expenditure on Neighbourhood Safety and seek to maximise grant funding			
Coverage:	Service specific			
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** In order to achieve a balanced budget the aim is to significantly reduce staffing in Community Safety Neighbourhood Safety Wardens team would be reduced significantly with only priority areas receiving a service Wider community safety team staffing would also be reduced i.e. NSOs. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** The team deliver a number of statutory functions. The team contribute towards compliance with a range of acts including Environmental Protection Act 1990, Housing Acts, Environment Act 1995. Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act, Crime and Disorder Act, Policing Act, Dog control related legislation, Public Health legislation, Traffic Management legislation. **Differences from any previous approach** There are currently: • 35 Neighbourhood Safety warden posts, with 16 vacant posts. • 7 Neighbourhood Safety officer posts, no vacancies • 9 Environmental Neighbourhood Safety warden posts, no vacancies in this group. • 6 environmental operatives that sit within the team. there are currently 52 posts, if agreed the proposal would be reduced by around 60%. The impact of the proposal will be partially mitigated by the inclusion of an alternative funding source for town centre based warden activity. **Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)** All Elected Members who represent their constituents. Residents of Middlesbrough Cleveland Police, Cleveland Fire Service, Probation, Health, PCC, Voluntary and community sector. **Intended outcomes.** To reduce the cost of delivery of the service by ceasing the non-statutory elements of the service.			
Live date:	April 2023 onwards, subject to staff consultation			
Lifespan:	April 2023 onwards			
Date of next review:	NA			
Date of next review:	NA			

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).	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No concerns were identified at stage one in relation to this element.
Equality						
Age	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	No concerns were identified at stage one and no concerns have been raised in relation to these protected characteristics.
Disability	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Gender reassignment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Pregnancy / maternity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Race	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Religion or belief	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sex	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Marriage / civil partnership**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Criminal record / offending past**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

** 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		
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	The level 1 impact assessment identified that the proposal would result in a reduction in the service to focus on statutory elements only. The service will focus on Town Centre area which will enable it to continue to support positive community cohesion within the town centre, there will however be a reduced ability to replicate this approach in other communities in the town if they experience anti-social behaviour which impacts on community relations between communities of interest and in neighbourhoods. The proposed use of external funding will mitigate the impact of the reductions in part to protect the town centre area however the service delivers across the whole town and the proposal will reduce the ability of the service to undertake work that supports community relations in the wider communities of the whole town. The service reduction will maintain statutory functions but non statutory elements will be removed. The service will work with Cleveland Police who have a statutory duty to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour in communities to support them to address issues however there will be reduced ability to deploy physical resources. Consideration was given as to whether the proposal could be avoided. It cannot be avoided because of the need to ensure the Council is able to balance its budget. Mitigations put in place will partially mitigate the impact of the proposal but not fully. It was then considered whether the proposal could be justified. The proposal is justified because of the need to protect statutory services within the Council to ensure they are able to continue to deliver statutory functions and ensure the council complies with its statutory.

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Introduction of the town centre team as part of the steps to implement the saving, utilising external funding.	Marion Walker	March 2023 onwards
	Work with Police colleagues to share intelligence about crime and anti-social behaviour to ensure they are aware and therefore able to respond accordingly	Marion Walker	April 2023 onwards
Promotion	Changes to operation will be promoted on the Council's website and with partners.	Marion Walker	April 2023 onwards
Monitoring and evaluation	Ongoing monitoring of the impact to be reviewed within the project put in place to deliver the saving.	Marion Walker	April 2023 onwards

Assessment completed by:	Marion Walker	**Head of Service:**	Marion Walker
Date:	26/1/2023	**Date:**	26/1/2023