Appendix 3

Annex 1 Level 2 Impact Assessment

Subject of assessment:	**Reduction in grants to the Voluntary and Community Sector.**			
Coverage:	All wards			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☐ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☒ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☐ **Review**
	☐ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☒
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☒
Description:	**Key aims, objectives and activities** 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. **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** 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. **Differences from any previous approach** Following consultation, the proposal has been amended slightly to be achieved by • ceasing the small grants programme saving £0.127m in 24/25 which is for one-off grants for residents and small community groups. • a 20% reduction in 24/25 on the community chest and development grant budgets resulting in a saving of £0.011m. 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. **Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)** Groups and individuals that would have applied for the grant and those previous recipients of the grants who may apply for another grant **Intended outcomes.** Reduction in level of financial support available for both constituted and resident groups to apply for.			
Live date:	01.04.24 onwards			
Lifespan:	ongoing			
Date of next review:	April 2025			

Assessment issue	**Impacts identified**				**Rationale and supporting evidence**
	None	**Positive**	**Negative**	**Uncertain**	

			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	There were no concerns that this proposal could have an adverse impact on human rights within the stage one impact assessment.
Equality						
Age	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	Within the stage 1 impact assessment, it was identified that the proposals would have a potential disproportionate adverse impact on all the relevant protected characteristics because of the nature of the proposal which is to reduce financial support to community and more formally constituted groups who generally are seeking funding in order to have a positive impact on their area, geographic community or a community of interest. Examples of funding given in the past to support these groups and organisations can be mapped to nearly all the protected characteristics and given the nature of the funding the removal of it could potentially impact negatively on all the groups. In line with the PSED, this stage 2 assessment has been completed to assess whether it can be justified, following completion of the Stage 1 impact assessment which concluded that it could not be avoided or fully mitigated due to the serious nature of the financial difficulties the Council is facing which has resulted in the Council having to apply for Exceptional Financial Support from government. Given this it is concluded that the impact is justified. 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.
Disability	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Gender reassignment	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Pregnancy / maternity	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Race	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Religion or belief	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Sex	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Sexual Orientation	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Marriage / civil partnership**	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Criminal record / offending past**	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	

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

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	The stage 1 impact assessment identified concerns on potential impacts on communities as a result of reduced capacity to support geographic communities and communities of interest. As with the above assessment, this stage 2 assessment has been completed to assess whether it can be justified, following completion of the Stage 1 impact assessment which concluded that it could not be avoided or fully mitigated due to the serious nature of the financial difficulties the Council is facing which has resulted in the Council having to apply for Exceptional Financial Support from government. Given this it is concluded that the impact is justified. Evidence used 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.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Work with MVDA to identify alternative funding opportunities.	L Graham	ongoing
Promotion	Promote alterative funding opportunities in partnership with MVDA	L Graham	ongoing
Monitoring and evaluation	Monitor uptake of the revised grants programme and escalate concerns should it result in unexpected impacts that require further consideration	L Graham	6 months

Assessment completed by:	S Barker	**Head of Service:**	Louise Graham
Date:	9/2/2024	**Date:**	9/2/2024

Subject of assessment:	**ECS 03 Junk Job Chargeable Collections**			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	☐ **Strategy**	☐ **Policy**	☒ **Service**	☐ **Function**
	☐ **Process/procedure**	☐ **Programme**	☐ **Project**	☒ **Review**
	☒ **Organisational change**	☐ **Other (please state)**		
It is a:	**New approach:**	☐	**Revision of an existing approach:**	☒
It is driven by:	**Legislation:**	☐	**Local or corporate requirements:**	☒
Description:	• **Key aims, objectives and activities** To 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. • **Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)** 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: • The size and type of the collection receptacle(s); • Where the receptacle(s) must be placed for the purpose of collecting and emptying; • The materials or items which may or may not be placed within the receptacle(s). • **Differences from any previous approach** This proposal is to remove the current 2 tiered approach (as shown below) & 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. • **Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)** The key stakeholders are Environmental Services, Residents & Members. The service will be reviewed only following a process of member/public consultation. • **Intended outcomes.** 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 Councils future saving targets in 24/25 financial year.			
Live date:	1st April 2024			
Lifespan:	From 1st April 2024 onwards			
Date of next review:	N/A			

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	There were no concerns identified at stage one that this proposal could have an adverse impact on human rights.
Equality						
Disability	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	Within the stage 1 impact assessment, it was identified that the proposals would have a disproportionate adverse impact on disability and age protected characteristics. Although there are some mitigations possible by signposting to charities who could assist, it is not possible to wholly avoid this impact within the current proposal. Consideration was given to whether this impact could be fully mitigated, however it cannot be fully mitigated without retaining free services for some which would result in non-achievement of the savings target / increased revenue target that would be set for the service. In line with the PSED, consideration was then given as to whether this impact can be justified. It is felt that given the size of the savings required in order to maintain a financially sustainable council and the partial mitigation that has been put in place, that the impact is justified.
Age	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
Gender reassignment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	Following completion of the level 1 impact assessment, there were no concerns that the proposals could have a disproportionate, adverse impact on any of these groups.
Pregnancy / maternity	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Race	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Religion or belief	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sex	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Marriage / civil partnership**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Criminal record / offending past**	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

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

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	No concerns were identified in relation to community cohesion within the stage 1 assessment process.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Amendment of the council's website to highlight that the service is now a payable service, while also signposting the sources of independent support that are available for those unable to pay as well as signposting to the waste recycling centre for those who are able to self-serve.	K Bargewell	1 April 2024
Promotion	See above	n/a	n/a
Monitoring and evaluation	The service will monitor uptake and fly tipping levels to assess the impact of the proposal and escalate formally if required.	D Metcalfe	Ongoing

Assessment completed by:	Andrew Mace	**Head of Service:**	Andrew Mace
Date:	24 January 2024	**Date:**	24 January 2024