

Middlesbrough Council

Budget 2024 / 25

Appendix 3 Budget Consultation Feedback

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This appendix is to present final findings and recommendations of the 2024/25 budget and the Medium Term Financial Plan consultation.
- 1.2. Consultation launched on the 21 December 2023 and concluded on 18 January 2024. This paper reports the results of that consultation, including a summary of the findings from the survey, in-person events and submissions. The purpose of this report is to ensure the findings of the consultation are presented to elected members and considered in relation to the budget setting process.

2. Budget consultation approach

- 2.1. A number of channels were used to promote the consultation programme and a number of different avenues were used to enable the public, staff and businesses in the town to contribute, including:
 - An online consultation that sought views on each proposal that could impact on the public, as well as on the proposed Council Tax increase
 - The Let's Talk email address that people could use to send views or ask questions through
 - Four in person consultation events were held in the North, East, West and South of the town, led by the Mayor and Executive Member for Finance and Governance, and attended by senior officers
 - Promotion of the consultation on the Council's social media channels
 - Inclusion of information on the consultation in a Council newsletter that was sent to over 44,000 people
 - Councillors were provided with details of the budget consultation to enable them to share with residents in their ward
 - Formal press releases and media appearances by the Mayor and Executive Member for Finance and Governance
 - Member briefings on the budget proposals
 - Attendance of Mayor and Executive Member for Finance & Governance at Overview and Scrutiny Board, and individual scrutiny panels considering budget proposals with relevant Executive Members invited to attend.
 - Formal consultation with the North East Chamber of Commerce.

3. Participation and survey responses

3.1. As a result of the above:

- 1171 people responded to the questionnaire. The highest response rate the Council has had to a consultation in the last 5 years.
- 50 people sent emails or completed a webform in order to comment on the consultation.
 - Additional, targeted consultation of residents who would be subject to the proposed charges and they were asked to either complete the survey or contact the Council through the Let's Talk email address. As a result, of the emails received to that address, 30 referenced the proposed charges for Resident Permit Charges. Most were objections in relation to the proposed charges. The issues summarised in the survey column were raised as well as some support, subject to appropriate enforcement being put in place, concerns about the impact on streets with Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs), suggestions that they should be addressed as well and concerns from a business operating in the area that would need to visit multiple addresses
 - Other comments received related to an objection to changes to waste and green waste collection services, closure of the Captain Cook Birthplace Museum, introduction of charging at Stewart Park Car Park and a question around recent planning issues and decisions.
 - two suggestions for alternative savings were made by the public as part of this – incentivisation of fly tipping reporting and a suggestion that the Council assures itself that it is recovering ICT equipment from employees and elected members as they leave the organisation.
 - In addition to the above, 8 staff contacted the Council with concerns in relation to LGS07 (Review of Subscription Spend) budget proposal. This will be subject to separate staff consultation, prior to any decision to implement by officers which will consider those concerns. Concerns related to terms and conditions, implied contract terms and the ability to attract staff to the service. This proposal was replaced by an alternative savings proposal.
- Four consultation in person events were attended by approximately 90 people. Topics raised during those events included objections to:
 - The closure of Captain Cook Birthplace Museum
 - Introduction of car parking charges at Stewart Park
 - Objections to the range of proposed charges and changes for waste services.
 - Charges for residents' parking permits.
- 10 social media posts were made during the consultation period to highlight the consultation. Estimated total reach was 36,525 people
- Councillors were provided with details of the budget consultation to enable them to share with residents in their ward.
- An email newsletter was sent promoting the consultation. It was sent to 44,390 people and 12,792 were opened.
- Some proposals were supported by additional targeted consultation with those affected to ensure they were fully engaged in the process.
- A letter from the Chamber of Commerce was received which highlighted concerns about the unprecedented budget pressures on the Council, support for the proposal to close the Captain Cook Birthplace Museum, and concern that the budget position could

preclude the Council from taking advantage of development fund opportunities available in relation to devolution.

- Overview and Scrutiny Board submitted one proposal relating to Community Grants, which has been incorporated into the revised proposals.

3.2. Those who completed the online budget consultation were asked if they would complete demographic information to support analysis of responses.

3.3. The tables below summarise the resulting demographic information:

Overall Numbers		Count	Row %
Ethnic group	White British	975	83.26%
	BAME	66	5.64%
	Prefer Not to say	88	7.51%
	Blank	42	3.59%
Gender	Male	531	45.35%
	Female	531	45.35%
	Prefer Not to say	72	6.15%
	Blank	37	3.16%
Disability	Declared Disability	901	11.60%
	Declared they do not have a disability	93	76.9%
	Prefer not to say	136	7.9%
	Blank	41	3.5%
TOTAL	All Respondents	1171	

Type of responder¹	Count
Have a business in Middlesbrough	56
Live in Middlesbrough	1021
Work for Middlesbrough Council	148
Work in Middlesbrough	445
Other	64
Blank	24

4. Consultation findings

4.1. Consultation is the process of dialogue with citizens and stakeholders based upon a genuine exchange of views, with the objective of informing decisions, policies or programmes of action. It gives the local community a voice in the democratic process and helps elected members and officers understand and consider public views and concerns when making decisions about local public services. As a result of the consultation, a number of the proposals have been amended and one withdrawn, as set out of the end of this document. While councillors are not obliged to change their budget proposals in light of the outcome of the consultation, they are required to have due regard to it in making

¹ Some individuals selected more than one category; therefore this number does not add up to 1171.

their decisions around the Council's Council Tax levels and the Medium-Term Financial Plan. The findings from the consultation process are summarised below:

Proposals	Online budget consultation			Free text comments summary - comments made most frequently related to
	No. in agreement	No. against	No. neutral	
ASC01: Accommodation and Support review	511 47%	143 13%	425 40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Further information requested ▪ Concerns about impact on the vulnerable ▪ Finance concerns ▪ A view that this should not be funded by local taxpayers ▪ Support and objection for the proposal
ASC07: Fairer Charging/Fair Cost for Care	554 51%	205 19%	327 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost concerns and impact on those who don't claim benefits ▪ Impact on the vulnerable, the disabled and families ▪ Request for further detail ▪ Support for the proposal ▪ A view that this should not be funded by taxpayers.
ASC09: Review of Independent Living Schemes	533 50%	143 13%	398 37%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ability to use digital solutions ▪ Lack of detail ▪ Preference for in-person care ▪ Impact on the vulnerable ▪ Support for the proposal
ASC10: Expand Autism Day Care through relocation to Cumberland Resource Centre	604 57%	105 10%	358 33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about distress and disruption ▪ Concern about impact on staff and service levels ▪ Concern about possible increased travel time
ASC11: Re-provision use of Levick Court	515 49%	128 12%	417 39%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about moving and rehoming vulnerable residents ▪ More information needed ▪ Impact on the most vulnerable ▪ Support for the proposal ▪ Concern that residents must be consulted
ASC13: Review of Direct Payments	651 61%	63 6%	360 33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More detail requested ▪ Still need to support people who can manage their own finances who are not able to use direct payments ▪ Impact on the vulnerable
ASC14: Court of Protections Service Charges	487 46%	164 15%	422 39%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about impact on the most vulnerable ▪ Concern about targeting the most vulnerable for changes ▪ Views that it should be free or means tested
CC07: Special Guardianship Order payment review	653 61%	100 9%	319 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns the proposal was not clear ▪ Support for the proposal ▪ Concern this could result in people refusing to care for children and more ending up in care of the Council.

Proposals	Online budget consultation			Free text comments summary - comments made most frequently related to
	No. in agreement	No. against	No. neutral	
EDC01: Review of Integrated Transport Unit arrangements	627 58%	117 11%	328 31%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parents should pay and arrange travel for their children and current service abused by some ▪ Questioning whether internal council provision was cheaper than outsourcing ▪ Support and objections to the proposal ▪ Views that the service was essential
ECS01: Fortnightly Collection residual waste	436 39%	557 50%	119 11%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns that this could result in increases in fly-tipping, smell, public health and vermin ▪ Concerns around the size of the bins and access to larger bins ▪ Concerns about cost to implement ▪ Suggestions to achieve the saving by encouraging increased recycling
ECS02: Green Waste collection charge	340 31%	623 56%	150 13%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns that this could result in increases in fly-tipping ▪ Concerns about ability to pay ▪ Negative Impact on the environment
ECS03: Junk job collection will be chargeable	598 54%	310 28%	199 18%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns that this could result in increases in fly-tipping ▪ Concerns about ability to pay ▪ Support for the proposal ▪ Impact on those less able to dispose of items without the service – disabled and the poor
ECS04: Replacement wheeled bins charge	385 35%	463 42%	247 23%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns about fairness of charges if bins were stolen, vandalised or damaged by refuse works ▪ Concern about theft ▪ Concerns about increases in fly-tipping ▪ Financial concerns
ECS07: Cease council financial support for Environment City	531 49%	192 17%	366 34%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for the proposal ▪ Concern about impact on Council green ambitions and climate change
ECS08: Resident Parking permit charge	379 34%	460 42%	268 24%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objection that residents have to pay to park near their homes ▪ Financial concerns ▪ Concern at impact on carers / health workers ▪ Concerns about enforcement
ECS09: Car parking charge at Stewart Park	286 26%	691 61%	151 13%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced use of the park ▪ View that it should be free ▪ Health and wellbeing concerns ▪ Knock on impact to residents nearby ▪ Impact on families ▪ View that the park was gifted to the town

Proposals	Online budget consultation			Free text comments summary - comments made most frequently related to
	No. in agreement	No. against	No. neutral	
ECS10: Review of Community Facilities	463 43%	176 16%	436 41%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient information ▪ Charging will reduce use ▪ Concern the proposal could mean facilities will close ▪ Support for the proposal
REG03: Concentrate the town's museum offer in the Dorman Museum and withdraw from Captain Cook Birthplace Museum (CCBPM)	390 35%	533 47%	206 18%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loss of history and heritage ▪ Should be promoted to boost visitors ▪ Impact on education provision ▪ Accessibility of Dorman Museum ▪ Suggestions for alternatives to closing CCBPM including increasing charging, alternative funding and increasing use by groups
FIN08: Reduction in the allocation of recourse for voluntary and community sector grants from the LA	377 35%	232 21%	480 44%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Negative impact on community spirit and on groups that rely on them ▪ Impact on vulnerable ▪ View that groups are filling gaps in public services ▪ Suggestion that grants should only be given to groups that benefit the council
FIN11: Closure of Cashiers at Middlesbrough House	555 51%	178 16%	360 33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about impact on the elderly and the vulnerable ▪ Low level of savings suggest its not financially worth doing ▪ not everyone wants to pay online ▪ support and objections ▪ Concern it is discriminatory to those who want to pay with cash
Do you agree with our proposal to increase Council Tax by a total of 4.99%?	404 34%	733 63%	34 3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Council should concentrate on debt collection from non-payers ▪ The Council should reduce staffing instead and reduce senior management salaries ▪ The Council should lobby government for more funding ▪ The Council should sell more assets ▪ The Council should review purchasing card spending ▪ The Council should stop unnecessary road and infrastructure changes
If the Government were to allow a higher increase in the Council Tax than the current proposed 4.99% increase in 2024/25 in order to help balance the Council's budget, would you agree to this?	167 14%	969 83%	35 3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Top heavy management structure and cost of senior managers ▪ Poor budgeting concerns ▪ Financial impact concerns ▪ Concerns around impact on residents who are already dealing with cost of living concerns ▪ Suggested review of Councillors costs, numbers and expenses claims.

4.2. Following consultation, **the following proposals were amended:**

Proposal	Rationale
ASC07: Fairer Charging/Fair Cost for Care	This proposal will be subject to further consultation before it is brought forward for in-year consideration through an appropriate governance route.

ASC11: Re-provision use of Levick Court	This proposal will be subject to further consultation before it is brought forward for in-year consideration through an appropriate governance route.
REG03: Concentrate the town's museum offer in the Dorman Museum and withdraw from CCBPM	<p>In recognition of the wealth of feeling in the community and the suggestions forthcoming from the consultation, together with the helpful attitudes of both ward councillors and the Captain Cook Birthplace Trust the Mayor has been assured that there are more, and better options than closure.</p> <p>Therefore, the decision on the future of the Captain Cook Birthplace Museum will be deferred until 30 September 2024 to provide time for other alternative options to be explored. A decision will be taken by the Executive and will be subject to further consultation as required. As a result, the savings proposal is amended:</p> <p><u>Review and implementation of alternative operating models for Capitan Cook Birthplace Museum.</u></p> <p>This will be achieved following a review of options including an alternative 3rd party provider, changes in operations to reduce operating costs (utilising volunteers, or improved building management i.e. insulation) and increase income by changing the offer to attract more visitors or withdrawal from the site and investing in offer at the Dorman Museum</p>
FIN08: Reduction in Voluntary and Community Sector grants	<p><u>Reduction in the allocation of resource for voluntary and community sector grants from the local authority.</u></p> <p>Following consultation feedback from the Overview and Scrutiny Board (OSB) the savings proposal 'FIN08 Reduction in Voluntary and Community Sector grants' has been amended. The proposed savings will still include ceasing the small grants programme saving £0.127m in 24/25, but following the OSB proposal, a provision for one-off grants for residents and small community groups will be incorporated in a merged Community Chest and Development Grants budget for which criteria will be reviewed and revised. These two merged budgets will, as previously proposed, see a 20% reduction in 24/25 a saving of £0.011m, leaving £0.042m. Support will be offered to enable organisations to access external grant funding opportunities, and a business case to access some Better Care Fund monies to support grants for vulnerable people in the communities will be developed.</p> <p>As the core grants are under a contractual service level agreement the 20%, or £0.028m saving, on this part of the budget will be deferred to 25/26 to allow for revised negotiations and service level agreements to be developed following the final year of a 3-year agreement.</p>

4.3. Following consultation, **the following proposal was withdrawn:**

- Introduction of a car parking charge at Stewart Park following consideration of feedback from across the whole town.

ECS09 Car Parking Charge at Stewart Park	Introduction of a £2 daily car parking charge at Stewart Park. This will require the introduction of a resident parking scheme in nearby streets.
--	---

4.4. Below is a summary of the considerations and rationale for those proposals where there was a higher negative response than positive response from the public, excluding those amended or withdrawn and the proposals on Council Tax increase are listed below:

Proposal	Rationale
ECS08: Resident Parking Scheme	These schemes relate to a small part of the town that requires additional Council action to support resident parking and enforce compliance with it in order to ensure residents are able to park near their home and other car users are diverted to more appropriate locations. That activity and enforcement comes at a cost. The proposed charge contributes towards the cost of administration and enforcement, many other councils already have such a charge, and many have a higher charge. By also attaching a charge we aim to limit the amount of passes that are misused by non residents to utilise parking closest to the town centre. An element of the proposal is that the current £10 for care professionals visiting the area, payable by their employer, is not amended.
ECS01: Fortnightly residual waste collections	<p>The proposal will bring practice into line with most other councils and will support efforts to also improve recycling rates. The Waste Service has experienced significant budget pressures in 2023/24, (£1.0m Quarter 3 forecast Outturn), this is primarily due to a combination of household behaviour with regards to recycling and the cost of disposal. The cost of disposing of recycled waste (average disposal rate is £53.01 per tonne) is much lower than the cost of residual waste (disposal rate is £72.56 per tonne). Further, it is important to note that there is a significant cost to disposing of waste incorrectly. Residual waste that is put in the recycling bin causes contamination to the recycled waste stream and is rejected by waste operators and diverted to the residual waste stream for which the Council has to pay to process twice (average residual waste disposal rate of £173.78 per tonne). Based upon 2021/22 available comparative data, Middlesbrough has one of the lowest recycling rates of all single tier authorities at 29.8% compared to a mean of 42.3% for English Unitaries. Whilst the amount of residual waste is higher than most single tier authorities at 701kg per household compared to 554kg</p> <p>The implementation of this proposal will go alongside significant communication and education plan to ensure residents are supported in their move to the new system. Based on the experiences of other authorities, it is not expected that this proposal will result in a significant increase on fly-tipping.</p>

The proposed implementation plan includes adjustments for those who require a larger waste bin, families of 3 or more will be able to request a 240 Ltr wheel bin. Following a proposal from back-bench councillors, families of 2 will be able to purchase an additional 140 Ltr wheel bin, the cost will be a one off fee of £40.

The Council will continue to provide assisted bin collections for those who meet the thresholds for that support, and areas with communal bins or residents who are only served by black sack collection as they are not accessible for wheelie bins, will continue on weekly collections. When comparing to neighbouring authorities this proposal brings us in line with residual waste collection proposals.

RESIDUAL	Middlesbrough	Darlington	Durham	Hartlepool
Bin Size (litres)	140 & 240 (3 or more in family)	240 & 360 (5 or more in family)	140, 180, 240	240
Collection Frequency	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly
Maximum Number of Bins	1 x 240 or 1 x 140 or 2 x 140	1	Information Not available	1
RESIDUAL	NYCC (Stokesley)	Redcar & Cleveland	Stockton	
Bin Size (litres)	Multiple depending on area	240 & 360 (5 or more in family)	240 & 360	
Collection Frequency	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Weekly	
Maximum Number of Bins	1	1	1	

ECS02: Green Waste charges

This is a discretionary service which many councils already charge for and only benefits households in those parts of the town who have gardens. It will be optional, with an opt in process, and the new green bins will only be supplied and charged for as when requested. Free disposal will continue to be available to those who wish to use the Household Waste and Recycling Centre. This proposal is an enhanced service than current, and collections will run from first week of April until end of November on a fortnightly basis. The proposal is in line with green waste services compared to neighbouring authorities.

Green Waste Comparative	Middlesbrough	Darlington	Durham	Hartlepool	NYCC (Stokesley)	Redcar & Cleveland
Price	£40.00	£39.00	£38.00	£32.00	£43.50	£40.00
Bin Size (litres)	240	240	240	240	240	240
Collection Frequency	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Monthly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly

ECS04: Charges for bins	Charges will be introduced in 2025/26 with the indicative fees below, enabling the Council to put other measures in place first in response to concerns about potential bin theft and to allow the roll out of the new bins associated for some households with green waste and/or fortnightly refuse collections. The Council will continue to replace bins at no cost where they have been damaged by Council operatives.				
	RESIDUAL	Middlesbrough	Darlington	Durham	Hartlepool
	Bin Charges	Replacement £ 16.75 Proposal from 2025/25 Replacement Bin Charges: 140 Ltr £20.45, 240 Ltr £23.50, 240 Ltr Green £37.50 Extra Bin 140 Ltr £40	Replacement - £ 23.90 240 £ 60.60 360	£ 25 replacement or new property £ 55	Replacement £ 45 240 and £ 64.00 360
	RESIDUAL	NYCC (Stokesley)	Redcar & Cleveland	Stockton	
	Bin Charges	Information not available	£ 30 240 £ 45 360	£ 25 240 & £ 35 360	

4.5. To summarise, following the budget consultation and further review, the changes made to the budget savings previously proposed in December 2023 report are outlined in the table below:

Savings Proposals 2024/25	2024/25 £m	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	TOTAL £m
December 2023 Proposals	(14.038)	(5.083)	(1.967)	(21.088)
ECS09 - Car Parking Charge at Stewart Park	0.000	0.060	0.000	0.060
REG03 - Capitan Cook Birthplace Museum.	0.100	(0.100)	0.000	0.000
FIN08 - Reduction in the allocation of resource for voluntary and community sector grants from the local authority.	0.028	(0.028)	0.000	0.000
LGS07 - Review of Subscription spend	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000
LGS08 - Reduction in Member Allowances	(0.006)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Revised Savings Proposals 2024-25	(13.910)	(5.151)	(1.967)	(21.028)

Overall Budget Impact Assessment 2024/25

Subject of assessment:	Middlesbrough Council Budget 2024/5			
Coverage:	Crosscutting			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please state) Budget		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Key aims, objectives and activities</p> <p>By law the Council has to agree a balanced budget annually. The purpose of this Impact Assessment is to assess the cumulative impact of the 2024/25 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those savings identified in the report for consultation with the public because they were considered to potentially affect front line service delivery levels. These initiatives will form part of the 2024/2025 revenue budget and were subject to the impact assessment process and consultation prior to consideration by Full Council as part of the 2024/2025 revenue budget setting process. 			

The following proposal was removed from following public consultation

- Introduction of charging for car parking at Stewart Park.

The following proposals were amended following the consultation process:

- Concentration of the town's museum offer in the Dorman Museum and withdrawal from the Captain Cook Birthplace Museum
- Reduction In Voluntary and Community Sector grants.

The following proposals were moved to an in year decision, following further development and/or consultation:

- Re-provision use of Levick Court
- Fairer charging / fair cost of care

A general consultation email address was launched along with a consultation section on the Council's website, social media promotion and in-person events led by the Mayor. This resulted in 1171 responses to the survey, 50 emails to the email address, around 90 people attended consultation events, 36,525 saw the social media posts. Some proposals were supported by additional, targeted consultation where appropriate.

Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)

A number of statutory duties, guidance, legislation and regulations are relevant to this proposal which will be considered, these include but are not limited to:

- Budget setting - Local Government Act 1972
- Individual proposals – various as set out in individual Impact Assessments
- Impact Assessment process – Equality Act 2010.

	<p>Differences from any previous approach</p> <p>The budget sets out a range of changes to services and functions as a result of financial pressures on the Council. These are outlined in the main body of the report.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external)</p> <p>All residents of Middlesbrough and customers of MBC. Some proposals are more relevant to certain groups than others and this is set out within the individual assessments, which are also appended and the excel table. Some proposals also impact on staff.</p> <p>Intended outcomes</p> <p>To present a budget to Council that has given full consideration to the impact of proposals and gives proper consideration to the Council's equality duties.</p>
Live date:	April 2024 onwards
Lifespan:	April 2024 – March 2025
Date of next review:	March 2025

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals impact on human rights. None of the assessments have identified that there could be an adverse impact on human rights as a result of a proposal.
Equality						
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Feedback on the impact assessments completed for the Budget Consultation identified 16 as being potentially relevant to age and disability protected characteristics.
						<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIN08 Reduction in grants to the Voluntary and Community Sector • ENV03 Junk Jobs <p>Detail set out below:</p> <p>Reduction in grants - Within the stage 1 impact assessment, it was identified that the proposals would have a potential disproportionate adverse impact on all the relevant protected characteristics because of the nature of the proposal which is to reduce financial support to community and more formally constituted groups who generally are seeking funding in order to have a positive impact on their area, geographic community or a community of interest.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
						<p>Examples of funding given in the past to support these groups and organisations can be mapped to nearly all the protected characteristics and given the nature of the funding the removal of it could potentially impact negatively on all the groups. In line with the PSED, a stage 2 assessment was completed to assess whether it can be justified, following completion of the Stage 1 impact assessment which concluded that it could not be avoided or fully mitigated due to the serious nature of the financial difficulties the Council is facing which has resulted in the Council having to apply for Exceptional Financial Support from government. Given this it was concluded that the impact would be justified.</p> <p>Junk jobs - Within the stage 1 impact assessment, it was identified that the proposals would have a disproportionate adverse impact on disability and age protected characteristics. Although there are some mitigations possible by signposting to charities who could assist, it is not possible to wholly avoid this impact within the current proposal. Consideration was given to whether this impact could be fully mitigated, however it cannot be fully mitigated without retaining free services for some which would result in non-achievement of the savings target / increased revenue target that would be set for the service. In line with the PSED, consideration was then given as to whether this impact can be justified. It was felt that given the size of the savings required in order to maintain a financially sustainable council and the partial mitigation that has been put in place, that the impact was justified.</p>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Impact Assessments (stage one and two) attached to the report identified that one proposal was potentially relevant to all the protected characteristic and that there could be a disproportionate adverse impact on individuals or groups because of one or more of any of the protected characteristics following completion of stage 2 impact assessment because of the nature of the support accessed through these grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIN08 Reduction in grants to the Voluntary and Community Sector
Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pregnancy / maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Examples of funding given in the past to support these groups and organisations can be mapped to nearly all the protected characteristics and given the nature of the funding the removal of it could potentially impact negatively on all the groups. In line with the PSED, a stage 2 assessment was completed to assess whether it can be justified, following completion of the Stage 1 impact assessment which concluded that it could not be avoided or fully mitigated due to the serious nature of the financial difficulties the Council is facing which has resulted in the Council having to apply for Exceptional Financial Support from government. Given this it was concluded that the impact would be justified.
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Criminal record / offending past**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	One out of the 17 impact assessments that were completed as part of the budget consultation process identified concerns in relation to the potential impacts the proposal to reduce grant support to the Voluntary and Community Service could have 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The stage 1 impact assessment identified concerns on potential impacts on communities as a result of reduced capacity to support geographic communities and communities of interest. As with the above assessment, this stage 2 assessment has been completed to assess whether it can be justified, following completion of the Stage 1 impact assessment which concluded that it could not be avoided or fully mitigated due to the serious nature of the financial difficulties the Council is facing which has resulted in the Council having to apply for Exceptional Financial Support from government. Given this it is concluded that the impact was justified.

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 2024/25	Chief Executive	May 2024

Assessment completed by:	Ann-Marie Johnstone	Head of Service:	n/a
Date:	9 February 2024	Date:	n/a

Annex

1	Budget Consultation Impact Assessment Level 1
2	Budget Consultation Impact Assessment Level 2