

## Appendix 3 – Annex 1 Level 1 Impact Assessment

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ASC01 Accommodation and support review			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b></p> <p>To review provision to consider an alternative source of funding which can be used to fund the support costs to a number of sheltered housing provisions. This work will identify eligible sources of funding, which will mitigate the impact to residents and the services being provided, there will be no financial impact on residents in 2024/25. Phase 2 of this work will include completing a review with the registered social provider for the larger schemes, concerning the historical funding arrangements of support into a number of sheltered housing schemes. This work will consider alternative funding opportunities, with a decision to be taken in 24/25 concerning the future funding arrangements for these schemes should alternative funding sources not be identified.</p> <p><b>Statutory drivers</b></p> <p>Middlesbrough Council has no statutory duty to provide housing related support with sheltered accommodation services. However the following statutory duties are relevant in relation to care:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Care Act 2014</li> <li>- Housing Benefit Regulations 2006</li> <li>- Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 Section 2 – provision of support and arrangements to meet identified needs</li> <li>- Section 49 Care Standards Act 2000</li> <li>- Sections 22 and 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences from any previous approach</b></p> <p>Previously the provision was funded via the Supporting People Grant, when this grant ended in 2009, it was agreed to continue funding housing related support in older persons sheltered services from the Social Care budget. Many other Local Authorities ceased funding the support element of sheltered housing in its entirety when the Supporting People Grant ended in 2009. The proposal is that people will continue to be supported to access appropriate accommodation, however it will be through alternative funding streams, rather than the Council's core budget.</p> <p><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b></p> <p>Service Users, Families, Carers and Sheltered Accommodation providers.</p> <p><b>Intended outcomes</b></p> <p>That those who require services and meet needs thresholds continue to receive them but that alternative sources of funding are used to deliver the provision.</p>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Not Applicable			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This proposal does not impact negatively on individual Human Rights and subsequent protocols.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes engagement to date, feedback from the budget consultation and analysis of the likely impact from the proposal.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</li> <li>c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> The proposal is potentially relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics. The nature of the actions set out in the proposal are to reconfigure the funding source of these sheltered housing services, providing continuity to the existing tenants. Existing service users should see no change to their service as the saving will be made by reconfiguring the funding stream.  Evidence used to inform this assessment is that by remodelling the current offer we are able to retain some non statutory, low level prevention support services for the older population of Middlesbrough, however the proposed change is in relation to reconfiguring the funding source. Evidence used to complete this assessment also included analysis of the budget consultation proposal which found that 511 were in favour of the proposal and 143 against. Analysis of the free text comments did not identify any unforeseen potential impacts on one or more of the protected characteristics. There were some concerns about risks to vulnerable people expressed, however there will be no changes to the service delivery model, just the funding sources. Those in receipt of services will continue to be appropriately safeguarded.
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposal could impact adversely on community cohesion. The schemes will continue to provide support to the tenants via an Intensive Housing Management service, funded via Housing Benefit claims. Evidence used to inform this assessment included analysis of the budget consultation proposal and the detail of the proposal which has been designed to minimise impacts
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				

\* 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	

Assessment completed by:	Heather Weir	Head of Service:	Louise Grabham
Date:	22/1/2024	Date:	23/1/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	<b>ASC11 Re-provision use of Levick Court</b>			
<b>Coverage:</b>	This initiative is to provide alternative residential care for the current service users and seek opportunities to maximise the utilisation of the property working with partner organisations.			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p><b>Description:</b></p>	<p><b><u>Aim:</u></b> To establish a new respite model for Middlesbrough Council Adult Social Care at Levick Court.</p> <p><b><u>Objective:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To remodel respite provision for adult services.</li> <li>• To maximise use of Levick Court.</li> <li>• To explore relocating our permanent residents of Levick Court into alternative accommodation.</li> <li>• Engage with potential partners around the use of Respite within Levick Court.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Statutory Drivers</u></b></p> <p>Carers are entitled to have their needs assessed including the need for respite care however there is no statutory duty for a local authority to provide this service. However there a number of statutory requirements placed upon the Council to meet identified needs. The provision of Respite contributes towards compliance with those duties. Decisions around the future of the service would also be relevant to the Disability Discrimination Act and the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p><b><u>Differences from any previous approach</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Previous approach:</u></b></p> <p>22 Levick Court is a residential and respite unit for adults with learning disabilities between the ages of 18 and 65 years and comprises of 8 residential and 8 respite beds. Demand for the respite service has diminished in recent years and the unit functions on around 50% occupancy, although Continuing Health Care (CHC) funding for some service users did supplement some of the vacant beds due to the nature of that funding. Future demand for respite care remains unclear.</p> <p><b><u>The proposal is that:</u></b></p> <p>The council will seek an alternative agency to locate services on the site and convert their residential into a respite unit. A working group had been set up to explore this proposal in more detail.</p>
	<p><b><u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Service Users and their families and/or carers – There are currently 8 service users who permanently reside at Levick Court.</li> <li>▪ A review of staff will need to be undertaken which will be determined once the requirements of the service has been remodelled.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Intended outcomes</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To establish better use of Levick Court and respite provision.</li> <li>• To find suitable alternative accommodation for residents who currently reside at Levick Court council building.</li> </ul>

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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 therefore none of the absolute or qualified rights will be infringed by these proposals.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process to date which found that no concerns in relation to human rights.</p>
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p><b>Service users</b> – There are currently 7 individuals with learning difficulties who permanently reside at Levick Court. The review could impact on the 'disability' characteristic should the final proposal be to relocate these residents to alternative accommodations (care homes). At this stage the impact on the group is uncertain as it is subject to consultation with service users and their advocates as the detail of the final proposal is still to be developed.</p> <p>The aim and decision to re-model the service will be to enable development of an underused resource facility to support our respite provision.</p> <p>Staff – A review of the staffing will be undertaken once the service requirements have been determined. Discussions will be held with all of the staff concerned and a review process will be undertaken which will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportional adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic.</p>

\* 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	
				<p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process to date. Further consultation with individuals will be required once finalised proposals and proposals around possible relocation have been developed. 515 people who responded to the public consultation undertaken as part of the budget setting process were in favour and 143 were against.</p> <p>Further consultation will be undertaken with service users and families affected by the proposal once the detail of the proposal is finalised. Following this consultation, a stage 2 impact assessment will be completed and an in-year decision taken around the proposal.</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	☒	☐	☐	<p>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.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process to date. Further consultation with individuals will be required once finalised proposals and proposals around possible relocation have been developed. 515 people who responded to the public consultation undertaken as part of the budget setting process were in favour and 143 were against. Further consultation will be undertaken with service users affected by the proposal once the detail of the proposal is finalised. Following this consultation, a stage 2 impact assessment will be completed and an in-year decision taken around the proposal.</p>
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Suzanne Hodge	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Suzanne Hodge
<b>Date:</b>	22/1/2024	<b>Date:</b>	22/1/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ASC09 Review of Independent Living Schemes			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b></p> <p>A review of our Independent Supported Living schemes in partnership with our providers to maximise the use of digital technology to promote the independence of the tenants within these services, and to complete a full review of the costs associated with the schemes, including consideration of further opportunities for shared care. The review will re-model the funding and contracting arrangements relating to the provision of support to Independent Living schemes, primarily across the primary client group of learning Disability and mental health.</p> <p><b>Statutory drivers</b></p> <p>Middlesbrough Council has a statutory duty to ensure services deliver value for money. The following statutory duties are relevant in relation to care, this list is not exhaustive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Care Act 2014</li> <li>- Housing Benefit Regulations 2006</li> <li>- Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 Section 2 – provision of support and arrangements to meet identified needs</li> <li>- Section 49 Care Standards Act 2000</li> <li>- Sections 22 and 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences from any previous approach</b></p> <p>Historically Middlesbrough Council maximised the opportunities from the Independent Living fund and set up a number of schemes in which shared care was considered and tenants shared communal facilities. Goal orientated reviews were not undertaken, and care was delivered year on year with no account taken for independence and promotion of independent living skills. In addition, technology enabled care has not been fully explored within these schemes. This would be addressed in revised service delivery models.</p> <p><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b></p> <p>Service Users, Families, supported accommodation providers.</p> <p><b>Intended outcomes.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Review cost base for all providers through the completion of an equivalent fair cost for care exercise for support to independent living schemes</li> <li>b) Review void levels and agree a strategy for the future delivery of schemes – taking into account requests for more self-contained accommodation</li> <li>c) Ensure client reviews are goal orientated to maximise independence to improve outcomes for clients and increase independence</li> <li>d) Consider the opportunities that technology enabled care can deliver.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Not Applicable			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Not applicable			



Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This proposal does not impact negatively on individual Human Rights and subsequent protocols. Adult social care has a statutory duty to meet an individual's needs and this project will not impact upon delivery of services to meet assessed need.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>e) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</li> <li>f) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal is potentially relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics. The nature of the actions set out in the proposal are to assess the unit costs of the delivery of support services to Independent Supported living schemes, and to consider the use of technology in the delivery of services. Services users will continue to meet required services to meet their assessed need. The proposal would increase the performance focus of the model on increasing the independence of those being supported, as such it should lead to improved outcomes for individuals and potential reduced costs, where increased independence as a result of improved focus means that care packages can be safely amended to reflect a reduced need for support. Where it is not possible to use technology because service users are unable to use it, it will not be used.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the budget consultation which found that 543 were in favour of the proposal compared to 143 against and analysis of the free text comments which did not identify any new areas of concern in relation to potential adverse impacts on one or more of the protected characteristics under the Equality Act.</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposal could impact adversely on community cohesion. The schemes will continue to provide support to the tenants to meet their needs.

\* 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	
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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:	Louise Grabham	Head of Service:	Louise Grabham
Date:	24/01/2024	Date:	24/01/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ASC10 Expand Autism Day Care through relocation to Cumberland Resource Centre			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description</b>	<p align="center"><b><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u></b></p> <p><b>Aim</b> - To relocate the Middlesbrough Adult Autism Day care service from Sandringham to Unit 2 at Cumberland Resource Centre. Current activity from Cumberland will relocate to North Ormesby Resource Centre resulting in staff savings, £0.080m and a potential to generate additional income £0.050m</p> <p><b>Objectives;</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To relocate the service to Unit 2 at Cumberland Resource Centre</li> <li>To assess the impact of service change upon the existing Autism Day Care service based at Sandringham moving to Cumberland Resource Centre</li> <li>To develop and expand a Middlesbrough Adult Day care model for autism services.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Statutory drivers</u></b></p> <p>There is no statutory duty to provide an Autism Day Service for Adults. There is however a statutory duty to assess people's needs, under the <b>Care Act 2014</b>. This service forms one of the ways in which those identified needs are met. The <b>Autism Act 2009</b> also says that there has to be a government strategy for improving services for autistic adults, underpinned by legally binding guidance to councils. Decisions around the future of the service would also be relevant to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the <b>Equality Act 2010</b>. The Equality Act requires that the needs of people with a disability are considered and that steps should be taken to take these into account. As this proposal relates to a service whose primary focus is on service users who have autistic needs, then this provision is particularly relevant to this proposal.</p>			
<b>Description continued</b>	<p><b><u>Differences from any previous approach</u></b></p> <p>Middlesbrough Council provides a Community Inclusion Service Autism Day Care service that was previously based at Sandringham House but has now moved to Unit 2 Cumberland Resource Centre, Linthorpe. The autism day care service is part of an inclusion service that also provides other satellite outreach services in the Middlesbrough Community for Adults with Learning Disabilities. The service provides support, learning and development services for adults over a Monday to Friday 9.00am-4.30pm period.</p> <p>The service has relocated the Autism service for adults to a different resource.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within a resource provision that can provide services that are the same, varied and are able to continue to meet people's needs.</li> <li>The service will continue to access the local community for supportive social, learning and development at other community hubs in the South Tees area.</li> <li>The new resource will aim to continue to provide varied professional services to adults, and their carers around a varied and flexible timescale.</li> <li>Continue to maintain liaisons with partner agencies and expand the programme of activities with local partners.</li> </ol> <p>In terms of additional considerations such as transport the only change has been a change of route. Most individuals make their own way into services. There is likely to be no or minimal impact around any additional cost for individuals as any change will be accommodated in their assessed allowance.</p> <p>The outcomes relating to relocating the group from Sandringham to Unit 2, Cumberland Resource Centre (CRC) will also allow for expansion of the service within CRC and generate increased income.</p> <p><b><u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service users – There are currently 20 service users on the register, with 4 in transition for 2024. A maximum of between 14 -18 places per day over 5 days within Unit, which could be increased to between 18-22</li> <li>Service user families and carers from a neighbouring local authority (Redcar &amp; Cleveland) have 3 individuals placed at Sandringham.</li> <li>There are 6 staff members who have transferred with the service, none are affected by the proposal.</li> <li>1:1 care support provided through various independent care agencies.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Intended outcomes.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To continue to provide a community /day care service provision for Adults with Autism, albeit at a different location.</li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To eventually expand and broaden the scope of the service provision within the whole of Cumberland Resource Centre including in line with central government directives around creating All Age provision.</li> <li>To ensure that the current users accessing the Autism Day care service provision are not disadvantaged by the relocation.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Live date:</b>	March 2024 onwards
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Not applicable.
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Not applicable.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the absolute or qualified rights will be infringed by these proposals.  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.
<b>Equality</b> 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? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act.</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic.</li> </ul>

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal is particularly relevant to the disability protected characteristic.</p> <p><b>Service users</b> – There is a register of 20 people, on average, between 14 people (Monday to Friday) access the Autism Day care service at Unit 2, Cumberland daily. The service users age range is from 18 +. We have 4 people in transition for 2024/25 hence numbers would rise to 24.</p> <p>Individuals live in a variety of locations around Middlesbrough, with 3 individuals accessing from another local authority (Redcar &amp; Cleveland). In terms of current travel arrangements individuals either use Council transport, taxis' their own transport, public transport or walk to the various community satellite venues.</p> <p>There may be some increased costs pending relocation for those individuals who use taxis or their own transport. For those new transport users, ability to pay will in future be considered as part of the Care Act 2014 assessment criteria to ensure appropriate charging was undertaken. The relocation of the service provision will be expected to be delivered to the same standards.</p> <p><b>Staff</b> – 6 staff work with the Autism Satellite group Discussions have been held with all of the staff around relocating to another venue. There is no risk to individual jobs hence the process of relocation will not need to be supported by a range of HR policies as there is no disproportional adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. Additional consultation has also been undertaken with service users affected. 604 respondents supported the proposal with only 105 objecting to it. Analysis of the free text results did not identify any previously unconsidered areas of concern.</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No direct impact on community relationships is envisaged.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, feedback from the budget consultation and additional engagement undertaken by the service which found that there were no concerns that the consultation could result in an adverse impact on community cohesion.</p>
<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Graham Clarke, Business Manager, Community Services			<b>Head of Service:</b> Suzanne Hodge – Head of Access, Prevention and Provider Services
<b>Date</b>	22/1/2024			<b>Date:</b> 23/1/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ASC07 Fairer Charging / Fair Cost of Care			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	Revision
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	Local
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> To ensure clients charges reflect the cost of care charged by revising costs in line with costs of delivery.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> The Care and Support (Charging and Assessment Of Resources) Regulations 2014.</li> <li>• <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> The revised policy would result in an annual cost review cycle being applied to ensure service delivery charges rise in line with costs.</li> <li>• <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> Adult social care clients are key stakeholders – those who are at their cap for charges will not be impacted. Those who pay for their services will have future service costs assessed annually against inflation costs</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes.</b> To ensure chargeable services costs are reviewed annually to reflect increases or decreases in the cost of their delivery.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	April 2024			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	From April 2024 onwards			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Fairer Charging policy next review date is			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The process within the 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.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal is identified as being potentially relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics. Those clients who are already assessed as paying the maximum charge will be unaffected by the proposal, as will those who do not meet the threshold for financial contributions. The policy continues to encompass these two groups with no change. Those who are eligible to pay for services would see the cost of their care reviewed annually to ensure that charges reflect the costs of delivery.</p> <p>The proposal will see the policy amended to also ensure any shortfalls between cost and delivery are met by the client, where they are eligible to pay for services. For example the council currently charges £17:72 to the client. The cost to the Council is actually £20.00, the shortfall of £2:28 is currently left for the Council to fulfil. The proposed change in the policy will enforce the shortfall which will fall to the service user.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes feedback from both the budget consultation and the additional consultation undertaken by the service, analysis of that feedback and the free text comments. The feedback from the budget consultation was that 554 were in favour of the proposal, compared to 205 who were against. Analysis of the free text comments did not identify any new issues for consideration in relation to one or more of the protected characteristics which have not already been articulated in this impact assessment. Analysis of respondents to the budget showed that those who declared they had a disability were more likely to disagree with the proposals than those who did not. 12% of respondents to the consultation declared they had a disability.</p>

\* 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	
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No this relates to clients receiving adult social care services and is linked to the application of relevant legislation.
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Louise Grabham	<b>Head of Service / Director:</b>	Erik Scollay
<b>Date:</b>	24/1/2024	<b>Date:</b>	25/1/2024



<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ASC13 Review of Direct Payments			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u></b>  A robust review of policy and application of Direct Payments within Adult Social Care to ensure the facility to support service users via Direct Payments is fully utilised to enable clients to live independently according to their needs and wishes via a strengths-based approach.</p> <p><b><u>Statutory drivers</u></b>  Direct Payments are monetary payments made to individuals who request to receive monies directly so that they can employ a carer / service provider of their choice to meet some or all of their eligible care or support needs. The legislative context for Direct Payments is set out in the Care Act 2014, Section 117 (2C) of the Mental Health Act 1983 and the Care and Support (Direct Payments) Regulations 2014.  Direct Payments have been used in Adult Social Care since the mid-1990s and whilst they are the Government's preferred choice for personalised care and support, they cannot be the default option as the individual or their representative must agree. They provide independence, choice and control by enabling people to commission their own care and support in order to meet their eligible needs.</p> <p><b><u>Differences from any previous approach</u></b>  There was a review of Direct Payments policy and procedures in 2021 by Adult Social Care.  We are looking to continue this approach, whilst ensuring that current policy and procedure remain fit-for-purpose. As a result, no planned changes to the policy are recommended at this stage, however there will be an ongoing review of payments made to ensure the payments are being appropriately used.</p> <p><b><u>Key Stakeholders &amp; Intended Beneficiaries.</u></b>  Those currently in receipt of payments, potential future recipients, families and carers.</p> <p><b><u>Intended Outcomes.</u></b>  We are seeking to ensure that current policy and procedures remain fit-for-purpose and to ensure that they are utilised effectively and any unspent monies are re-claimed in a timely manner.</p>			
<b>Live date:</b>	April 2024.			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Ongoing.			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	To be reviewed bi-annually.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	<p>Direct Payments are a mechanism to give those eligible for care and support greater choice and control over how their eligible needs are met. This is the Government's preferred method for provision of care and support but cannot be a default option and would not impact negatively upon individual Human Rights.</p> <p>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.</p>

---

\* 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	
<p><b>Equality</b></p> <p>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?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>Direct Payments provide personalised support, co-produced with those who have eligible needs. This mechanism increases choice and control for vulnerable clients and would not impact adversely upon individuals or groups with protected characteristics. The proposal is potentially relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because of the nature of it. There are no anticipated adverse impacts as there is no identified policy change required. The saving will be achieved by increased compliance checks to ensure spending of direct budgets is in line with policy.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 651 people were in favour of the proposal and 51 were against it. Analysis of the free text responses to the consultation has not identified any previously unconsidered potential concerns around impact on one or more of the protected characteristics.</p>
<p><b>Community cohesion</b></p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>A review of current Direct Payment policy and procedures would not impact negatively upon different groups, neighbourhoods or communities within the town. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 651 people were in favour of the proposal and 51 were against it. Analysis of the free text responses to the consultation has not identified any previously unconsidered potential concerns around impact on community cohesion.</p>

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

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Lynn Beevers	<b>Head of Service:</b>	S E Disbury
<b>Date:</b>	22.1.24	<b>Date:</b>	22/1/24

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ASC14 Court of Protection Service Charges			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service specific.			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u></b></p> <p>To recoup costs in relation to management of court of protection cases where the council is appointed as a deputy in order to address a waiting list for this support and manage costs of service delivery.</p> <p><b><u>Statutory drivers</u></b></p> <p>The CoP3 form (Court of Protection assessment of capacity form) is used to submit an expert opinion about someone's mental capacity as part of an application to the Court of Protection for a Deputyship Order under the <b>Mental Capacity Act 2005</b>.</p> <p><b><u>Difference From Previous Approach.</u></b></p> <p>The council would start to charge the annual management fee in relation to this activity.</p> <p><b><u>Key Stakeholders &amp; Intended Beneficiaries.</u></b></p> <p>Key stakeholders would be our clients and their families, those waiting for support, the courts.</p> <p><b><u>Intended Outcomes.</u></b></p> <p>To improve support for those who require a deputy to manage their affairs and increase income to the Council to meet the cost of this service.</p>			
<b>Live date:</b>	April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Ongoing.			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	To be reviewed bi-annually.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	☒	☐	☐	<p>The proposed changes would not negatively impact upon the Human Rights of those for whom the Council seeks to apply for Deputyship. Rather, it would enable the Council to act upon recommendations as set out by the Court of Protection in a timely manner, offering a more robust service to our vulnerable clients.</p> <p>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.</p>

---

\* 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	
<p><b>Equality</b></p> <p>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?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>• advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>• foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The proposals are relevant to the disability and age protected characteristics. The proposals will enable the Council to support more individuals who require the Council to act as a Deputy for their finances and affairs to be able to access that service. Commencing collection of the management fee will enable the Council to fund additional capacity in order to address a backlog of support requests and maintain the financial costs of delivery going forward. Costs will only be applied to those above the defined financial threshold as set by Government. There are no concerns that this proposal could impact negatively on those who need to access support, it will incur a small cost but that will only apply to those with funds.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 487 people agreed with the proposal compared to 164 who objected. Analysis of the comments in the free text elements did not identify and new areas of concern not already considered and addressed by this impact assessment.</p>
<p><b>Community cohesion</b></p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There would be no impact upon community cohesion.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, feedback from the budget consultation. No concerns were identified as a result of this in relation to community cohesion.</p>

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.

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Lynn Beevers	<b>Head of Service:</b>	S E Disbury
<b>Date:</b>	28.12.23	<b>Date:</b>	29/12/23



<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	CC07 Special Guardianship Orders / Child Arrangement Orders			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> Undertake a review of policy and practice, aligning to regulatory requirements and Department of Work and Pensions benefit entitlements to ensure consistency in relation to payments made for Special Guardianship Orders (SGO) and Child Arrangement Orders (CAO) by ensuring that the Local Authority takes into account a residents financial resources, including any tax credits or benefits which would be available to the resident if a child lived with them.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> The Special Guardianship Regulations 2005, together with the Special Guardianship (Amendment) Regulations 2016 and the Adoption and Children Act 2002 confirms the income which should be taken into account by a Local Authority when considering making statutory payments of a Special Guardianship Order.</li> <li>• <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> Currently, the Financial assessments for both orders disregard any income received from central government (predominantly Universal Credit) in respect of tax credits which would be available to a resident on application. The revised proposals would take this into account and bring the Council in line with the Government's regulations (SGO Regulations 2005) which requires that the Council, when: (2) 'In determining the amount of financial support, the local authority must take account of any other grant, benefit, allowance or resource which is available to the person in respect of his needs as a result of becoming a special guardian of the child. (3) Subject to paragraphs (4) and (5) the local authority <b>must</b> also take account of the following considerations— (a)the person's financial resources, including any tax credit or benefit, which would be available to him if the child lived with him;'</li> <li>• <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> Residents who receive a Special Guardianship or Child Arrangement payment through the Council and receive the child element of Tax Credits or Universal Credit will be affected by implementing this change.</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes.</b> To align the Councils payments with the Governments Special Guardianship Regulations.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	01.04.24 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Not applicable			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>By bringing the SGO awards in line with the Government's regulations, this will ensure consistency for all residents applying for a payment. No individuals will have their Human Rights affected as a result of implementing a consistent way of working.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>• advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>• foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal is relevant to all members of the public, if they claim a Special Guardianship or Child Arrangement Order payment. It is potentially relevant to the age and disability protected characteristic because of the nature of the provision.</p> <p>The proposal will ensure all residents have future claims assessed in line with Government guidance to ensure that receipt of other benefits is taken into account when agreeing SGO or CAO payments. This would also apply to those who currently receive the payment. This will mean that in some instances, those residents who have received benefits and payments, will see a reduction in the financial support they receive through SGO or CAO. While the proposal will result in a reduction in financial support to some, the Council is obligated to implement it in order to ensure compliance with Government Regulations on the matter.</p>

\* 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	
				Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, analysis of government regulation obligations and feedback from the consultation process. 653 of those who responded to the budget consultation were in favour of the proposal, compared to 100 who were against it.
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Analysis of the proposal has identified no concerns in relation to community cohesion, those in receipt of payments will still continue to be able to access financial support in order to support them to care for the children in their care.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the budget consultation.
N/A				

Assessment completed by:	Martin Barker	Head of Service:	Janette Savage
Date:	22.1.24	Date:	23/1/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	REG03 Concentrate the town's museum offer in the Dorman Museum (80,437 annual visitors) and withdraw from the Captain Cook Birthplace Museum (5,360 annual visitors).			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> To reduce the cost of the Council's Museum Service as part of wider budget savings proposals.</li> <li><b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> The Council does not have a statutory duty to provide this service.</li> <li><b>Differences from any previous approach</b> Currently the Captain Cook Birthplace Museum (CCBM) is open to visitors 6 days a week (Tuesday – Sunday) from April to November each year. Its learning programme for schools operates all year-round during term time. The proposed change is that the CCBM will either be operated by another organisation or closed and integrated into the Dorman Museum offer, with the building used for other purposes.</li> <li><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> Visitors - including local residents and visitors from across the UK and overseas, Local school children – who participate in the annual learning programme, Museum staff, Trade Unions, Captain Cook Birthplace Trust, Captain Cook Society, Café tenant – who has an existing lease to operate from the CCBM building, Tees Valley Museums Group – a consortium of 7 Tees Valley Museums and an Arts Council National Portfolio Organisation, of which the CCBM is a member and recipient of funding, Funders – Including Arts Council England and National Lottery Heritage Fund.</li> <li><b>Intended outcomes</b> Reducing the cost of the Council's Museum Service through savings made from building costs.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	The Council would not reopen the Museum from 1 April 2024. The proposed staff savings won't be realised until a staff review has been undertaken, other than from any agreed removal of vacant posts in the Museum Service.			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Ongoing from April 2024 onwards.			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	N/A			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Having considered both the service that the CCBM provides and its audience base, there are no concerns that this proposal could have an adverse impact on human rights.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>• advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>• foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul>
				<p>The proposals are relevant to the age protected characteristics as they would impact on children &amp; young people, who currently benefit from the learning programme delivered at the CCBM. While this would be transferred to Dorman Museum, overall capacity to deliver school programmes would be reduced.</p> <p>Currently the Museum Service has the capacity ability to deliver up to 236 workshop days for schools across its two sites. Last year, circa 3,000 children participated with opportunity for growth in this area up to a maximum capacity of 7,000 children annually. The proposal is expected to reduce this capacity to a maximum of 78 workshops and 2,340 children.</p> <p>Given the above the proposals would have a disproportionate adverse impact on the age protected characteristic which can only be partially mitigated by the transition of the learning programme to the Dorman site.</p>

\* 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	
				<p>In addition there were some concerns identified in the free text responses to the concern about the accessibility of Dorman Museum. The site is currently being subject to renovation to ensure it is fully accessible. Therefore there are no concerns that moving to this site could have a disproportionate adverse impact on those with a disability in terms of the accessibility of the building.</p> <p>In line with the PSED, a stage two Impact assessment will be undertaken to assess whether the residual adverse impacts on the age protected characteristic can be fully mitigated and if it cannot, whether it can be justified.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, analysis of usage and analysis of feedback from the consultation process. Of those who responded to the survey question on the proposed closure, 390 were in favour of the proposal while 533 disagreed with it. Free text comments raised concerns about impacts on the education offer which have been set out in this impact assessment.</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, analysis of usage and analysis of feedback from the consultation process.</p>
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Gaye Kirby	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Richard Horniman
<b>Date:</b>	23/1/24	<b>Date:</b>	23/1/24

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ECS 01 Fortnightly collection residual waste.			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> As in line with most Councils, the proposal is that the Council will introduce the fortnightly collection of residual waste. This will assist in the Council's efforts to increase recycling. The impact will be a reduction in the number of full time Residual Waste Operatives from 41 to 29 and savings on fuel and equipment. This will include the offering of bigger 240ltrs bins to those with families with 3 or more and moving, where possible, those areas on black bags to wheeled bins. Areas that have communal bins collections will remain on weekly collection. Those who have medical needs or larger families will have their needs assessed and larger or additional bins will be offered. In order to improve the level of recycling, increased waste education and communication will take place to ensure people understand which waste should be put in which bin and encourage residents to do so. To change the residential refuse collections from the current weekly cycle to that of fortnightly. This will lead to a reduced service cost base and subsequently contribute a financial saving to the Council of circa £350K. The financial saving is a key component in achieving Middlesbrough Council's future saving targets in 2024/25.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> Under the terms of the Environmental Protection Act, 1990, Middlesbrough Council (the 'Council') is classed as a Waste Collection and Disposal Authority, and as such, under section 45 (1), has a statutory duty to collect household waste from all domestic properties in the Borough. Under Section 46(4) of the Act, the Council has specific powers to stipulate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The size and type of the collection receptacle(s);</li> <li>• Where the receptacle(s) must be placed for the purpose of collecting and emptying;</li> <li>• The materials or items which may or may not be placed within the receptacle(s).</li> </ul> <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> If agreed, current weekly collections to fortnightly, with the provisions set out above. Assisted bin collections will still be provided for those who need them. </li> <li>• <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> The key stakeholders are residents and staff.</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes.</b> To reduce the cost of service delivery in order that a financial contribution is made towards the 2024/25 financial year. Additionally, it is expected that residents will adopt improved recycling activities, leading to improved recycling rates. Middlesbrough Council's current recycling rate is 33.49% placing ourselves in 279<sup>th</sup> position out of 345 Councils. Middlesbrough Council will roll out a series of "Behavioural change" tools, Educational Literature, Social Media awareness campaigns &amp; Recycling Roadshows all aimed towards greater resident participation to improve our current recycling status &amp; effective domestic waste management. In turn this is expected to contribute towards the Government target of 65% recycling rate by 2035, for municipal waste.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	N/A			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	N/A			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Equality</b> 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?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>Service users – the proposal is potentially relevant to the age and or disability protected characteristics. If individuals holding those characteristics were less able to dispose of their waste, we would offer an assisted collection service where appropriate in line with existing policy. There would also be opportunity to dispose of bulk waste in way of logging a One-Off Collection at a cost should that proposal be accepted. There are no concerns that this could have disproportionate or adverse impact on these groups.</p>
				<p>All Refuse Service Staff are within the scope of the review. If implemented the proposal would result in a reduction of 12 posts. Relevant HR policies will also be applied to support staff and mitigate adverse impacts from this review including the early retirement/voluntary redundancy scheme, the redeployment policy, Reviews, Consultation and Redundancy Policy which have been separately impact assessed.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, service provision and feedback from consultation. 436 people and organisational representatives were in favour of the proposal when asked in the Council's budget consultation survey, compared to 557 who were against. Analysis of the free text comments in the proposals revealed no previously unconsidered areas of concern. Existing policy is already in place to support those who require assistance and variations to bin size are available on the basis of assessed need.</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Not applicable. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an impact on community cohesion.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 436 people and organisational representatives were in favour of the proposal when asked in the Council's budget consultation survey, compared to 557 who were against. Analysis of the free text comments in the proposals revealed no previously unconsidered areas of concern in relation to community cohesion. Those areas with communal bins will see them continue to be emptied weekly.</p>

\* 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	

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:	23 January 2024	Date:	23 January 2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ECS02 Green Waste Collection Charge			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> As with most councils, the proposal is to introduce charging for Green Waste collections. The service will run fortnightly from the beginning of April until the end of November. This will include the continuation of fortnightly collections throughout this period rather than the current monthly collections in October and November. The annual subscription charge will be £40 for the first bin then £20 per addition bin, up to a maximum of 5 bins per household. This would change the domestic Green Waste Collection service from free of charge to a chargeable service. The change will reduce Middlesbrough Council's costs base, generate an income and encourage residents to compost their Green Waste.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> Under the terms of the Environmental Protection Act, 1990, Middlesbrough Council (the 'Council') is classed as a Waste Collection and Disposal Authority, and as such, under section 45 (1), has a statutory duty to collect household waste from all domestic properties in the Borough. Under Section 46(4) of the Act, the Council has specific powers to stipulate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The size and type of the collection receptacle(s);</li> <li>• Where the receptacle(s) must be placed for the purpose of collecting and emptying;</li> <li>• The materials or items which may or may not be placed within the receptacle(s).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> To change the service from free to an annual subscription of £40. Should residents require an additional Green waste bin, these can be procured from MBC at a cost of £20 per bin, up to a maximum of 5 bins per property. The collection frequencies in October and November will increase from once per month to fortnightly.</li> <li>• <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> The key stakeholders are Residents, staff.</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes.</b> To maintain a green waste service but to introduce charges for it.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	From 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	N/A			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.  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.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> Service users – the proposal is potentially relevant to the age and or disability protected characteristics. If individuals holding these characteristics were less able to dispose of their waste, the council offers an assisted collection service where appropriate in line with existing policy. Residents who have disabilities &/or mobility issues can phone Middlesbrough Council Contact Centre and request this free service. There are therefore no concerns that this could have disproportionate or adverse impact on these groups.  There is no staffing impact within the scope of this review, as staff reductions will be achieved by employing less seasonal staff.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, service provision and feedback from consultation.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 557 people disagreed with the proposal, compared to 436 who supported it. Analysis of the free text responses also indicated that there were no concerns raised relevant to the PSED that have not already been taken into consideration when designing the proposal.
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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, feedback from the budget consultation and additional engagement undertaken by the service which found that there were no concerns in relation to community cohesion arising from this 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.

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

Assessment completed by:	Craig Coverdale	Head of Service:	Andrew Mace
Date:	23/1/2024	Date:	23/1/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ECS 03 Junk Job Chargeable Collections			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> To Introduce a £24.50 charge for a bulky household waste collection, in general this will be for up to five items. This will provide a more streamlined service than the two tier system in place currently.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> Under the terms of the Environmental Protection Act, 1990, Middlesbrough Council (the 'Council') is classed as a Waste Collection and Disposal Authority, and as such, under section 45 (1), has a statutory duty to collect household waste from all domestic properties in the Borough. Under Section 46(4) of the Act, the Council has specific powers to stipulate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The size and type of the collection receptacle(s);</li> <li>• Where the receptacle(s) must be placed for the purpose of collecting and emptying;</li> <li>• The materials or items which may or may not be placed within the receptacle(s).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> This proposal is to remove the current 2 tiered approach (as shown below) &amp; to streamline the service. The council would charge £24.50 per Junk Job and remove the Free of Charge collection service. Currently MBC offer a 2 tiered system in that residents can request the service free of charge and are placed onto a booking system on a first come first served basis, with approx. appointments occurring up to 12 weeks after the request. Alternatively, they can pay £15 for the request to be fast tracked and the appointment usually occurs within 3 weeks of the request.</li> <li>• <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> The key stakeholders are Environmental Services, Residents &amp; Members. The service will be reviewed only following a process of member/public consultation.</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes</b> To cease the free Junk Job Collection service To increase the charge for the Junk Job Service The chargeable service will generate an annual income of circa £92,000 The generated income saving is a key component in achieving Middlesbrough Council's future saving targets in 24/25 financial year.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	From 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	N/A			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights.  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.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> There are no staffing implications within this proposed review.  The proposal is relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics. Those who are less able to avoid a financial charge for junk waste disposal by taking their waste to the tip would potentially be disproportionately affected by this proposal. 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.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 589 people who responded to the Council's budget consultation survey were in favour of this proposal, while 310 disagreed with it.
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could negatively impact on the community.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, feedback from the budget consultation.
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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
--------------------------	-----------------	------------------	-------------

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

**Date:**

23/1/2024

**Date:**

23/1/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ECS04 Replacement wheeled Bin charge			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> The introduction of an increased and full charge (as detailed below), for wheeled bins, will enable Middlesbrough Council to recoup the capital purchase outlay. This includes charging developers for new housing developments. Proposed costs (including delivery costs) - 140 Litre Bin £20.45, 240 Litre Bin £23.50, 240 Litre Green Waste Bin £37.50. This is an increase of £3.70 for 140 Litre bin, currently £16.75, and introduction of charge for recycling bin and new larger sized waste bins. This will include wheeled bins used for recycling. If a bin is damaged by a council operative, it will be replaced free of charge.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> None.</li> <li>• <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> The Council currently provide free Recycling &amp; Green Waste Bins. Additionally, they provide Residual waste base at a subsidised charge. The proposed costs (including delivery) - 140 Litre Bin £20.45, 240 Litre Bin £23.50, 240 Litre Green Waste Bin £37.50. This is an increase of £3.70 for 140 Litre bin, currently £16.75, and introduction of charge for recycling bin and new larger sized waste bins. This will include wheeled bins used for recycling. This charging proposal envelops charging for new housing developments.</li> <li>• <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> The key stakeholders are Environmental Services, Residents &amp; Members. The service will be reviewed only following a process of member/public consultation.</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes.</b> This new approach will look to recover the majority of the annual capital outlay for the purchasing of new wheeled bins.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	From 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Annual review within the Council's annual review of fees and charges			



Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights.  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.
<b>Equality</b> 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?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> There are no staff affected within the scope of this review. The proposal is relevant to all groups. There are no concerns that the proposal could disproportionately adversely impact any of the protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 385 people who responded to the Council's budget consultation survey were in favour of the proposal, compared to 463 who were against it. Demographic analysis of consultation responses showed those with a disability were less likely to support this proposal compared to those who did. There were however no free text comments that raised any concerns that those with a disability could be disproportionately adversely affected by the proposal.
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact negatively on the community.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the budget consultation process
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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
--------------------------	-----------------	------------------	-------------

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

**Date:**

23/1/2024

**Date:**

23/1/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ECS07 Cease council financial support for Environment City			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> Currently Middlesbrough Council provides financial support to Middlesbrough Environment City Charitable Trust. Annually £105,000 is provided to Middlesbrough Environment City, which enables the trust to employ 2 Management roles, along with a lease free premises to operate from. All will be removed.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> None.</li> <li>• <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> Middlesbrough Council will cease its £105,000 annual funding to the Middlesbrough Environment City Charitable Trust. The removal of this financial support will generate a £105,000 saving to MBC. <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> The key stakeholders are Middlesbrough Environment City, its trustees, and the residents it supports.</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes.</b> This proposal will generate a financial saving of £105,000 to the Council &amp; therefore contribute towards the 24/25 savings targets.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	From 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	N/A			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights.  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.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> Should the proposal be accepted, the company would need to assess the impact and if alternative funding could not be sought they would need to reduce their staffing costs by £105,000. The charity provides environmental awareness raising functions as well as delivery support for people to manage their homes through affordable warmth sessions. These functions are available from other charities and community groups that operate in the area. There are no concerns therefore that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on one or more of the protected characteristics.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 531 people who responded to the Council's budget consultation survey were supportive of the proposal, compared to 192 who were against.
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact negatively on the community.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the budget consultation process.
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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:	23 January 2024	Date:	23 January 2024

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



<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ECS08 Resident Parking Permits Charge			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Residents who live witing a current or any future resident parking zones			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> To encourage residents to consider alternative sustainable transport methods (such as walking, cycling and using public transport) to aid management of the local road network, to reduce congestion and to address resident concerns around parking near their homes where there is a need to do so. The income generated from the charges will contribute to the cost of operating resident parking schemes.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b> Managing and maintaining the local road network to secure the expeditious movement of traffic and avoid, eliminate or reduce road congestion - Section 16, Traffic Management Act 2004 , Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</li> <li>• <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> Currently resident and visitor permits are issued free of charge, the revision is to introduce a charge for these permits. The proposed charges are £25 for the first permit issued to a property and £40 for any additional permits. It is proposed the charges will be introduced from April 2024.</li> <li>• <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> Residents and businesses located within current or future resident parking schemes.</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes.</b> Encourage residents to use alternative sustainable transport options; resulting in better management of the local road network. The income generated will contribute towards the cost of operating the resident parking schemes.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	April 2024			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Between April 2024 and March 2025, then permits will be renewed on an annual basis as part of the fees and charges review			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	A desktop review will be undertaken after 6 months (Aug 24) and 12 months (March 25). If necessary this will be escalated to a formal review of the proposal.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p> <p>Alternative transport options are available other than a private vehicle.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal is potentially relevant to the Disability and age protected characteristics.</p> <p>The proposal applies to residents who live within an existing or future resident parking scheme and are motorists or have visitors who will park on the carriageway. Residents who live within a resident parking scheme and are blue badge holders, will be able to apply for a free resident parking permit by providing the required documentation with their application. This ensures that the proposed changes do not negatively impact on blue badge holders. Given this mitigation, there are no concerns that the proposal could disproportionately adversely impact on residents who may be less able to walk distances to their homes to the extent that they would qualify for blue badge support.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process as well as additional consultation undertaken.</p>

\* 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	
				<p>The Council had an email address available for residents to contact it during the consultation with questions, comments or objections to proposals. 47 emails were received to that account during the period, of those 23 were objections to parking permit charges. Many comments related to concerns around lack of enforcement. Some comments expressed concern around the impact on informal caring support provided by wider family groups to residents living in the affected areas. This will be mitigated through the provision of visitor passes for each household to be use which they can apply for at the same cost as a resident pass. Formal carers can receive a pass at a discounted rate as well to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>379 respondents to the main survey were in support of the proposal while 460 disagreed with the proposal. Those with a disability were less likely to support the proposal</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no concerns that the proposal could adversely affect community cohesion, though this will be one of the issues that is assessed during implementation to identify if there are any unintended impacts.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, 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. There were some comments that stated that increased enforcement would have a positive impact as it would increase access to car parking spaces and reduce residents challenging each other where some were currently not displaying a parking permit.</p>
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Craig Cowley	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Craig Cowley
<b>Date:</b>	23/1/2024	<b>Date:</b>	23/1/2024



<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ECS09 Car Parking Charge at Stewart Park			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Visitors to Stewart Park who travel by private vehicle			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b>            Introduce a £2 charge to park a vehicle in the car park at Stewart Park &amp; Resident Parking Schemes in surrounding residential streets. The resident parking schemes will need to be introduced to deter displaced parking by motorists trying to avoid paying parking charges in the car park by parking in nearby streets whilst visiting Stewart Park. The income generated from the parking charge will contribute to the maintenance of the car park.         </li> <li> <b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b>            Managing and maintaining the local road network to secure the expeditious movement of traffic and avoid, eliminate or reduce road congestion - Section 16, Traffic Management Act 2004, Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.         </li> <li> <b>Differences from any previous approach</b>            Introduction of £2 parking charge for using the car park at Stewart Park. Alongside this resident parking restrictions are proposed to be introduced to deter displaced parking.         </li> <li> <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b>            Middlesbrough Council Parks and Open Spaces Service, Organisers of events held at Stewart Park, Askham Bryan College, Visitors to Stewart Park and Residents living close to Stewart Park         </li> <li> <b>Intended outcomes.</b>            Encourage visitors to Stewart Park to consider alternative transport options the income generated from the charges will contribute towards the maintenance of the car park.         </li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	April – June 2025			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Scheme implementation April – June 2025, once introduced charges will remain in place.			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Six and 12 months after implementation and if any serious concerns are raised.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p> <p>Introduction of parking charges in open spaces is new for the Council but other authorities have introduced a charge within such car parks.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The charge applies to all motorists who travel by vehicle to visit Stewart Park. However, free parking will be in place for blue badge holders in line with Council policy for other Council operated car parks. This ensures that blue badge holders are not adversely impacted by this proposal.</p> <p>Feedback from the public online consultation survey identified that 691 respondents disagreed with the proposal while 286 supported it. Analysis of the free text comments identified a number of concerns in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty with individuals identifying concerns around impacts on those with a disability, the elderly and impacts on families. The proposed charge has been set at a minimal level, in addition there are provisions within the proposal to ensure those with mobility issues, severe enough to be able to access a blue badge, will be exempt from the charge.</p> <p>Given the above, there are no concerns that the proposals could disproportionately adversely impact on the age or disability protected characteristics.</p>

\* 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	
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Although there is a financial impact of introducing a parking charge, there will continue to be provision for community groups such as parkrun to meet and use the space. The level of charging has been kept to a low level to minimise impacts on groups.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the budget consultation.
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Craig Cowley	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Craig Cowley
<b>Date:</b>	23/1/2024	<b>Date:</b>	23/1/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	ECS10 Review of community facilities			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> A review of community facilities will include potential income generation from use of facilities, or alternatives to reduce operating costs.</p> <p><b>Statutory drivers</b> Not applicable</p> <p><b>Differences from any previous approach</b> The proposal is to increase income and reduce costs of running community facilities by ensuring more space within the buildings is used more often. The proposal will result in increased income which will ensure the saving can be met without impacting on current opening hours of facilities.</p> <p><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> Local communities and interest groups, residents and staff.</p> <p><b>Intended outcomes.</b> To maintain current service delivery levels around opening hours while also improving income levels.</p>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Not Applicable			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This proposal does not impact negatively on individual Human Rights and subsequent protocols.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>h) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</li> <li>i) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal is potentially relevant to the all the protected characteristics because community locations provide inclusive venues which can be accessed by all. The nature of the proposal means there will be no anticipated adverse impacts on those groups as the savings will be achieved by encouraging greater use of community spaces and protecting opening hours.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the budget consultation which found that 463 were in favour of the proposal compared to 176 against and analysis of the free text comments which did not identify any new areas of concern in relation to potential adverse impacts on one or more of the protected characteristics under the Equality Act.</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposal could impact adversely on community cohesion as under the proposals the facilities would remain and would current opening hours would be retained, the saving would be generated by increasing use of them. The schemes will continue to provide support to the tenants to meet their needs.

\* 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	
<p><b>Next steps:</b></p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p>				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Geoff Field	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Geoff Field
<b>Date:</b>	22/01/2024	<b>Date:</b>	23/01/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	EDC01 Review of Integrated Transport Unit Arrangements			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b></p> <p>To put in place efficiencies in services such as optimisation of routes and reductions in cost of in-house and external suppliers and review of out of area transportation and Children Looked After (CLA) transport arrangements.</p> <p><b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b></p> <p>- While there are no statutory drivers in relation to the operational elements of the Integrated Transport Unit which is the subject of this assessment. The service does support compliance with statutory duties in relation to home to school transport (Education Act 1996).</p> <p><b>Differences from any previous approach</b></p> <p>- No changes to policy will be made as part of this proposal. The saving will be achieved by improved efficiencies in route planning and reducing the costs of route delivery.</p> <p><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b></p> <p>- The key stakeholders are the internal Education and Transport departments within Middlesbrough Council, Childrens safeguarding services, staff in the service and service users and their families.</p> <p><b>Intended outcomes.</b></p> <p>- A transport offer that utilises routes and resources more efficiently.</p>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2024 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Ongoing			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	N/A			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The 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 inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process which found that no concerns in relation to human rights.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> The nature of the service means the proposal is potentially relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics. Reviewing the Integrated Transport Unit Arrangements for Efficiencies in Service will not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics as route planning and services will continue to be delivered in line with existing policy and taking into account identified needs of those transported. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process. 627 people and were in favour of the proposal when asked in the Council's budget consultation survey. 117 people objected. Analysis of comments made through this and other parts of the consultation process identified no areas of concern that had not already been addressed by the proposal.

\* 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	
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	☒	☐	☐	There is no evidence to indicate that service users and / or the wider community have any concerns about the impact of the proposal on community cohesion.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process. 627 people and were in favour of the proposal when asked in the Council's budget consultation survey. 117 people objected. Analysis of comments made through this and other parts of the consultation process identified no areas of concern that had not already been addressed by the proposal.
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				
<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Craig Cowley			<b>Head of Service:</b>
<b>Date:</b>	23/1/2024			<b>Date:</b>

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	FIN08 Reduction in grants to the Voluntary and Community Sector.			
<b>Coverage:</b>	All wards			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b>  The intent is to reduce the funding available to the sector by reducing the level of grant for the Community Chest (£33k) and Development Grant by 20% and deleting the small grants programme of £127k to the funding gap identified by the Council and the need to make savings. As a result, the local authority will have a single VCS grant fund with some of those resources identified to support small grants with revised guidance concerning eligibility.</p> <p><b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b>  There are no statutory obligations in relation to the provision of community grants, however decisions to remove support from groups who provide support to one or more of the protected characteristics will be relevant to the Public Sector Equality Duty as set out in the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p><b>Differences from any previous approach</b>  Following consultation, the proposal has been amended slightly to be achieved by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ceasing the small grants programme saving £0.127m in 24/25 which is for one-off grants for residents and small community groups.</li> <li>• a 20% reduction in 24/25 on the community chest and development grant budgets resulting in a saving of £0.011m.</li> </ul> <p>The core grants are under a service level agreement therefore a further reduction will be applied to the core grants in 25/26 to allow for revised negotiations and service level agreements to be developed following the final year of a 3-year agreement. 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><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b>  Groups and individuals that would have applied for the grant and those previous recipients of the grants who may apply for another grant</p> <p><b>Intended outcomes.</b>  Reduction in level of financial support available for both constituted and resident groups to apply for.</p>			
<b>Live date:</b>	01.04.24 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	ongoing			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	April 2025			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>k) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</li> <li>l) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The proposals are potentially relevant to all the protected characteristics because of the nature of the service which is to provide support for community groups. Analysis of previous recipients of grants shows that a significant number were to groups whose aims were to support individuals or groups with one or more protected characteristics. However, these are singular grants and do not constitute a recurring commitment. With a reduced level of funding there is reduced opportunity for organisations to access funding through 2024/2025 and beyond.</p>

\* 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	
				<p><b>Small grants</b> Grants are provided to a wide range of community groups, including those that support communities with protected characteristics, however the grant funding is short-term one-off funding and support will be given to groups to consider other funding sources.</p> <p>The impact of ceasing this programme is that some groups will no longer have access to Council resources so will need to either become more formal or self-financing. There may be some one-off activity such as area improvements will not take place in the short term unless those groups can access funding support from elsewhere. Support will be provided to access other funding where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Community chest</b> Currently Community Chest is aimed at those groups with a constitution and their own bank accounts etc. It is aimed more at activity-based projects such as supporting groups aimed at those with dementia/older people/those on recovery pathways etc. This is therefore relevant to the disability protected characteristic.</p> <p>It also aims to build capacity among groups to prepare them for application to external funders. Its budget of £33k was allocated every year but because this has always been a rolling programme there has never been a time when it stopped accepting applications. In addition to supporting some groups on an annual basis, this fund has proved to other funders that these groups have been supported by us so are trusted deliverers. In 2024/5 there will a reduced pot (-20%).</p>
				<p>The impact of reducing this programme may mean that some groups do not get support; newly established groups who use this fund as a practice to develop their skills at managing grants prior to applying elsewhere will no longer be able to do that. However, the grants are not meant to generate long term funding reliance and therefore support will be given to consider other opportunities.</p>

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
				<p>Currently the Development Grant funding can be used where there is an identified need and is not already met; where funding is needed to plug a gap i.e., where there is a grant in place but is not due to start until after current funding is due to come to an end; or where short-term funding is needed to progress a business model. It has a current budget of £20k. In 2024/5 this will be reduced by 20%.</p> <p>The impact of this is that some activities may cease and then take longer to restart as projects may need to go to staff recruitment; service users may disengage, or new projects may struggle to start. The outcome cannot be wholly avoided because of the serious financial situation the Council is in and the need to deliver savings to be financially viable. While attempts have been made to mitigate the impact of this proposal, it is not possible to fully mitigate it because of the nature of the support given by this grant to groups whose work is often linked to addressing poorer outcomes that can be associated with one or more of the protected characteristics. In line with the PSED, a stage 2 assessment will be completed which will consider whether, given the outcome cannot be avoided or fully mitigated, whether it can be justified.</p> <p>Evidence user to assess this includes analysis of recipients of previous of grant support, analysis of the budget consultation survey which identified that 377 were in favour of the proposal with 232 against. Free text comments in the survey contained concerns about impacts on the vulnerable and community spirit that have been assessed within the impact assessment.</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The decision may impact upon the Councils reputation and its relationship with Voluntary and Community sector. A reduction in funding may result in some activities within organisations reducing or ceasing, or not being developed which will impact upon recipients. The grants team will work in partnership with MVDA to support organisations to consider other funding opportunities through the utilisation of find a funder and funders networks.</p>
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Sharon Barker	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Louise Grabham
<b>Date:</b>	9/2/2024	<b>Date:</b>	9/2/2024

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	FIN11 Closure of Cashiers Middlesbrough House			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Key aims, objectives, and activities</b>  To close the cash office due to the reduction in demand for this service. An average of 37 customers per week pay in cash. To increase alternative methods of payment, improve payment automation and increase access to payment facilities for the public. Intended move to Direct Debit (where appropriate) and increase payments via the Council's online payment method. Customers can still pay in cash for their essential bills at Post Office or PayPoint facilities.  To reduce the processing and handling of cash to minimise the risk of loss and/or fraud. To provide alternative arrangements for vulnerable clients to continue to receive cash payments direct from the community bank. To make savings in costs associated with handling and processing cash. Support for customers transitioning to other methods of payment will be made available.</p> <p><b>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</b>  There is no statutory requirement to provide a cashing function, however the service does currently provide a route by which members of the public can comply with statutory obligations on them in relation to payment of Council Tax. It also supports Council compliance with obligations in relation to management of money for vulnerable clients, however this is not the only way of delivering this service.</p> <p><b>Differences from any previous approach</b>  The cashier desk will be closed and payments directed through alternative routes, pay point, direct debt, post office, on line etc alternative payment methods are already available that will support the removal of this function. Where payment support has been provided by the function to vulnerable groups (Estates Function where those who are unable to are supported to manage their banking and are able to access their money by collecting it from the desk) 3<sup>rd</sup> party solutions have been identified, arrangements will provide for a town centre location for payments to be collected.</p> <p><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b>  Businesses, residents, vulnerable clients, and officers, who use the cash office to pay and receive cash.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Intended outcomes.</b>  To close the cash office, improve payment methods, minimise risk of loss and fraud and to increase payments by Direct Debit and other electronic methods. To make savings in cash handling costs and to free up valuable space in Middlesbrough House while continuing to maintain support for vulnerable residents. Those residents who still want to pay direct will be signposted to pay points instead.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	01.04.24			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	Not applicable			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<b>Human Rights</b> Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The closure of the Cash Office will not adversely affect the public, businesses, vulnerable clients, or officers as alternative and non-discriminatory options will exist for all customers currently using the cash office.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Equality</b> 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Council must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>• advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>• foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal is relevant to all members of the public if they use the cash office. There are no concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on any groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law. The proposal is particularly relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because of the nature of the estates service and common concerns expressed about the elderly being less likely to be able to use digital services.</p>

\* 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	
				<p>The proposal will ensure all residents are treated about to access to the same methods of payments and current cash payments to vulnerable adults will continue using banking facilities.</p> <p>Communications and support for customers transitioning to other methods of payment will be made available as digital solutions may not be well received by some of the towns more vulnerable groups. Paypoint solutions will be available for those who do not wish to move to a digital payment method.</p> <p>Given the evidence above, it is not anticipated that there will be any disproportionate adverse impact on any groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, mitigations and feedback from the consultation process. 555 people who responded to the Council's budget consultation survey were in favour of the proposal while 178 were against. Analysis of the free text responses did identify some concerns in relation to impact on vulnerable customers and the elderly however these have been addressed by the content of the proposal.</p>
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There will be no negative impacts on any different groups as a result of this proposal. This does not discriminate against any groups and the service will be sensitive at all times to the needs of all applicants.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the budget consultation.</p>
N/A				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Maggie Burns	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Justin Weston/Janette Savage
<b>Date:</b>	03.01.24	<b>Date:</b>	03.01.24