

APPENDIX 3 – CONSULTATION IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

Overall Budget Impact Assessment 2025/26

Subject of assessment:	Middlesbrough Council Budget 2025/26			
Coverage:	Crosscutting			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please state) Budget		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Key aims, objectives and activities</p> <p>By law the Council has to agree a balanced budget annually. The purpose of this Impact Assessment is to assess the cumulative impact of the 2025/26 budget proposals. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) places a statutory duty on the Council to ensure that it identifies where decisions would impact disproportionately adversely on groups that share a protected characteristic under UK law and then consider those proposals in line with the PSED. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. To ensure compliance with the PSED the Council has identified what the impact of proposals will be. Where there is a risk that they will have a disproportionate adverse impact, consideration has been given to steps needed to avoid or mitigate that impact. Mitigation will include steps to take account of the different needs of groups and may result in adjustments to meet their needs. Where decisions cannot be fully mitigated or avoided, they must be justified if they are still brought forward, in order to comply with the PSED. This overall IA considers the overall budget process, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those savings identified in the report for consultation with the public because they were considered to potentially affect front line service delivery levels. These initiatives will form part of the 2025/2026 revenue budget and were subject to the impact assessment process and consultation prior to consideration by Full Council as part of the 2025/2026 revenue budget setting process. 			

	<p>The following proposal were identified as requiring public consultation within the overall budget consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECS14 Fleet Services increase in charges • ECS19 Council Car parking charges increases • ECA20 increases in fees and charges • EDC05 recharging for non-statutory school related transport by the Integrated Transport Unit <p>A general consultation email address was launched along with a consultation section on the Council’s website, social media promotion and in-person events led by the Mayor. This resulted in 361 responses to the survey, 1 email to the email address, around 25 people attended across three consultation events,</p> <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</p> <p>A number of statutory duties, guidance, legislation and regulations are relevant to this proposal which will be considered, these include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget setting - Local Government Act 1972 • Individual proposals – various as set out in individual Impact Assessments • Impact Assessment process – Equality Act 2010.
	<p>Differences from any previous approach</p> <p>The budget sets out a range of changes to services and functions. These are outlined in the main body of the report.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external)</p> <p>All residents of Middlesbrough and customers of MBC. Some proposals are more relevant to certain groups than others and this is set out within the individual assessments, which are also appended and the excel table. Some proposals also impact on staff.</p> <p>Intended outcomes</p> <p>To present a budget to Council that has given full consideration to the impact of proposals and gives proper consideration to the Council’s equality duties.</p>
Live date:	April 2025 onwards
Lifespan:	April 2025 – March 2026
Date of next review:	March 2026

Assessment issue	Impacts identified		Rationale and supporting evidence			
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals impact on human rights. None of the assessments have identified that there could be an adverse impact on human rights as a result of a proposal.
Equality						
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Feedback on the impact assessments completed for the Budget Consultation identified one as being potentially relevant to age protected characteristic.
						<p>EDC05 – Integrated Transport Unit charging</p> <p>The Impact Assessments attached to the report identified that the following proposal was relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics:</p> <p>‘Remove or recharge non-statutory and discretionary Home to School transport services where the council provides discretionary as opposed to statutory home to school transport services. These will be recharged to the relevant schools and/or health services.’</p> <p>The individual IA found that the impact was mitigated because services will continue to be delivered in line with existing policy and taking into account identified needs of those transported and that its impact on schools and vulnerable children had been considered within the design of the proposal which correctly places responsibility for the costs with the school or health provider who have the responsibility to fund if needed.</p> <p>As well as proposed budget reductions, the 2025/26 proposed budget includes a number of proposals to improve Adult and children’s safeguarding resources to improve outcomes. This will have a positive impact on the age and disability protected characteristics by increasing investment to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve practice and data quality for care packages in Adults Social Care • Fund more youth services sessions • Meet demand for overnight emergency accommodation.

Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Feedback on the impact assessments completed for the Budget Consultation identified two as being potentially relevant to disability protected characteristic.</p> <p>EDC05 – Integrated Transport Unit charging</p> <p>The Impact Assessments attached to the report identified that the following proposal was relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics:</p> <p>‘Remove or recharge non-statutory and discretionary Home to School transport services where the council provides discretionary as opposed to statutory home to school transport services. These will be recharged to the relevant schools and/or health services.’</p> <p>The individual IA found that the impact was mitigated because services will continue to be delivered in line with existing policy and taking into account identified needs of those transported and that its impact on schools and vulnerable children had been considered within the design of the proposal which correctly places responsibility for the costs with the school or health provider who have the responsibility to fund if needed.</p> <p>ECS19 – to review car parking fees to increase fees and charges above the 2% (average 3.5%) within the fees and charges policy for Council Car Parking. The proposed increases are potentially relevant to the disability protected characteristic where individuals with less mobility may need to access car parking. Blue badge provisions would be unaffected by the proposals, therefore there are no concerns that the proposal could disproportionately impact on a group or individuals because they hold one or more protected characteristics and the potential impact is mitigated.</p> <p>As well as proposed budget reductions, the 2025/26 proposed budget includes a number of proposals to improve Adult and children’s safeguarding resources to improve outcomes. This will have a positive impact on the age and disability protected characteristics by increasing investment to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve practice and data quality for care packages in Adults Social Care • Fund more youth services sessions • Meet demand for overnight emergency accommodation.
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Assessment issue	Impacts identified		Rationale and supporting evidence			
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pregnancy / maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Criminal record / offending past**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals are identified as having an impact on community cohesion.

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

Assessment issue	Impacts identified		Rationale and supporting evidence			
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Armed Forces Covenant						
Council delivered healthcare services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals are identified as having an impact on this area of the Armed Forces Covenant.
Compulsory Education - admissions; educational attainment and curriculum; child wellbeing; transport; attendance; additional needs support; and Service Pupil Premium funding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals are identified as having an impact on this area of the Armed Forces Covenant.
Housing, homelessness and disabled facilities grants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Those leaving the armed forces are prioritised for accommodation with current housing policies. There is one proposal within the budget setting process which is relevant to this protected characteristic which is to increase investment in staffing in homelessness services which will have a positive impact on this group.
Care leavers						
Care experienced people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposed budget reductions do not have any impact on care leavers, the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.</p> <p>The proposal to increase resourcing within the homelessness team will have a positive impact on care experienced people who are more likely to be homeless than their non-care experienced peers..</p>

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Promotion	Promotion of changes where there is an impact on service delivery will be undertaken	Individual IA leads	Various
Monitoring and evaluation	Overall monitoring of the impact will be embedded within performance management arrangements for 2025/26	Chief Executive	May 2025

Assessment completed by:	Ann-Marie Johnstone	Head of Service:	n/a
Date:	22 January 2025	Date:	n/a

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial Screening Assessment

Subject of assessment:	EDC05: Remove or recharge Discretionary Home to School transport services.			
Coverage:	Remove or recharge non-statutory and discretionary Home to School transport services where the council provides discretionary as opposed to statutory home to school transport services. These will be recharged to the relevant schools and/ or health services.			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Description:</p>	<p>Key aims, objectives and activities</p> <p>To put in place efficiencies for non-statutory services with an aim of recharging the costs of in-house and external suppliers whilst continuing to meet the transport needs of children attending settings who receive discretionary travel assistance.</p> <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</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 within the Home to School Travel Assistance Policy 2024/25 (reviewed each academic year) and legislation and other statutory guidance (Education Act 1996), (Travel to School Guidance June 2023). The students whom are currently being transported and funded by Middlesbrough Council are non-eligible for statutory transport.</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach</p> <p>No changes to policy will be made as part of this proposal. The savings will be achieved by improved efficiencies and recharging the costs for this service to the appropriate education setting or NHS provision.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</p> <p>The key stakeholders are the internal Access to Education Team, SEND and Inclusion and Transport departments within Middlesbrough Council, staff in the service, NHS/Health Professionals and associated support networks and service users and their families.</p> <p>Intended outcomes.</p> <p>A transport offer that utilises resources more efficiently for statutory transport, taking into account the difficult decisions that Local Authorities have to make to make the best use of the limited resources available to Middlesbrough Council whilst maintaining a legally compliant and safe travel and transport service for children. The recharge made to the education or NHS setting will ensure that these resources are fully utilised for statutory transport and that this non-statutory transport is supported by Integrated Transport Unit but not funded by its budget.</p>
<p>Live date:</p>	<p>1st April 2025 onwards</p>
<p>Lifespan:</p>	<p>Ongoing during Academic Year 2024/25 and 2025/26 – within financial year 2025/26</p>
<p>Date of next review:</p>	<p>The next review will be carried out during January 2025 in preparation for contract reviews for the new financial year 2025/26 starting on 1st April 2025. The service may need to continue up to the end of the current 2024/25 Academic Year. A later review will delay the issue of future tenders if the service is to continue beyond the current tendered route timescales.</p>

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Provisions for assessment in the Education Act 1996, Home to School Travel Policy, School Travel Statutory Guidance 2023 and support plans for adults ensure provisions for protections are in place to ensure 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.

* 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>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p>	☒	☐	☐	<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"> • eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <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"> • removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>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.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from the consultation process. 19% (67 people) of respondents disagreed with the proposal, compared to 53% (193 people) in favour. Analysis of the free text did identify some public concerns with the concept and its impact on schools and vulnerable children however these had been considered within the design of the proposal which correctly places responsibility for the costs with the school.</p>

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community Cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	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.
Armed Forces Could the decision impact negatively on those who are currently members of the armed forces of former members in the areas of Council delivered healthcare, compulsory education and housing policies?*	☒	☐	☐	Children and Adults who are SEND aged 5-25, adults over the age of 25 not attending an education setting, vulnerable children and adults and others who are temporarily based in the area will have the same protections as those who are eligible for travel support to schools, education setting or adult social care setting. Some applicants are entitled to priority interview or guaranteed interviews, where they meet the essential criteria , including Ex Armed Forces personnel, who have left the Armed Forces within the last 3 years, or are within 12 weeks of leaving (discharge papers must be provided).
Care Leavers Could the decision impact negatively on those who are care experienced?*	☒	☐	☐	Passengers within the service may be care leavers and therefore will continue to have the same protections as other eligible students or adults who are eligible for travel support to schools, education setting or adult social care setting. Some applicants are entitled to priority interview or guaranteed interviews, where they meet the essential criteria , including care leavers up to age 25 who have supplied the contact details of their Personal Advisor or Social Worker are guaranteed an interview providing they have evidenced they can meet the essential criteria (In order to access leaving care support, the applicant must have been in care for at least 13 weeks since they were 14 including some point at their 16 th or 17 th birthday).
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:	Ged Faint	Head of Service:	Craig Cowley
Date:	09/1/2025	Date:	09/1/2025

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	ECS14 – Fees and charges increases			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities – to amend charges as reflected in the fees and charges schedule, changes vary across the services provided and average to a 1% increase. The main increases are attributed to Bereavement Services and Highways Management Services. • Statutory drivers - There are no direct impacts, the Council will continue to deliver its statutory functions that may be relevant to the fees and charges levied. The Council's constitution sets out that fees and charges will be reviewed as part of the annual budget setting process. • Differences from any previous approach – no difference in approach, just an increase in charges • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries – members of the public who will use these services which the Council can charge for • Intended outcomes – to raise revenue income to mitigate the need for financial saving and reflect increase in costs of service delivery. 			
Live date:	1 st April 2025			
Lifespan:	April 1 st 2025 onwards			
Date of next review:	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The fees and charges proposed increases do not have any impact on the rights of an individual, therefore proposed savings do not adversely affect this. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. •Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. •Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. <p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic •take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; •encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. <p>The proposed increases do not have any impact on particular groups or individuals, so the proposed increase will not affect any groups or individuals in particular and there are no concerns that the proposal could disproportionately impact on a group or individuals because they hold one or more protected characteristics.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process. 31% (110 people) of responders disagreed with the proposal, compared to 23% (83 people) in favour. Most respondents (43% - 156 people) had no opinion on the proposal. No concerns were expressed within the consultation that the proposal could disproportionately adversely affect one or more groups with a protected characteristic.</p>
Community cohesion 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"/>	The proposed increases do not have any impact on particular communities, so the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.

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

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Armed Forces Could the decision impact negatively on those who are currently members of the armed forces of former members in the areas of Council delivered healthcare, compulsory education and housing policies?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed increases do not have any impact on members of the armed forces, or former members in the areas of Council delivered healthcare, compulsory education and housing policies so the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
Care leavers Could the decision impact negatively on those who are care experienced?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed increases do not have any impact on care leavers, the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
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:	Geoff Field	Head of Service:	Geoff Field
Date:	09/1/2025	Date:	09/1/2025

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	ECS19 – Council Car Parking			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities – to increase fees and charges above the 2% (average 3.5%) within the fees and charges policy for Council Car Parking. • Statutory drivers - There are no direct impacts, the Council will continue to deliver its statutory functions that may be relevant to the fees and charges levied. The Council's constitution sets out that fees and charges will be reviewed as part of the annual budget setting process. • Differences from any previous approach – no difference in approach, just an increase in charges • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries – members of the public who will use these services which the Council can charge for • Intended outcomes – to raise revenue income to mitigate the need for financial saving and reflect increase in costs of service delivery. 			
Live date:	1 st April 2025			
Lifespan:	April 1 st 2025 onwards			
Date of next review:	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The fees and charges proposed increases do not have any impact on the rights of an individual, therefore proposed savings do not adversely affect this. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. •Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. •Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. <p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic •take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; •encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. <p>The proposed increases are potentially relevant to the disability protected characteristic where individuals with less mobility may need to access car parking. Blue badge provisions would be unaffected by the proposals, therefore there are no concerns that the proposal could disproportionately impact on a group or individuals because they hold one or more protected characteristics.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process. There were no concerns expressed within the budget consultation that the process could impact adversely on one or more protected characteristics. 52% (188 people) of responders opposed the proposal, compared to 43% (155 people) in favour.</p>
Community cohesion 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"/>	The proposed increases do not have any impact on particular communities, so the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.

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

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Armed Forces Could the decision impact negatively on those who are currently members of the armed forces of former members in the areas of Council delivered healthcare, compulsory education and housing policies?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed increases do not have any impact on members of the armed forces, or former members in the areas of Council delivered healthcare, compulsory education and housing policies so the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
Care leavers Could the decision impact negatively on those who are care experienced?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed increases do not have any impact on care leavers, the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
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:	Geoff Field	Head of Service:	Geoff Field
Date:	09/1/2025	Date:	09/1/2025

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Fleet Services Increase charges			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities – to increase to cost of taxi testing fees from £38 to £40, to increase the subsidised cost of MOT's when the taxi test is carried out from £10 to £15, to increase the cost of Class IV MOT's from £37 to £50, to increase the costs of Class V MOT's from £48 to £55, to increase the cost of Class VII MOT's from £37 to £55 • Statutory drivers - there are no statutory drivers • Differences from any previous approach – no difference in approach, just an increase in cost • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries - taxi trade and members of the public who bring their cars to Fleet Services for MOT's • Intended outcomes – to raise revenue income to mitigate the need for financial savings. 			
Live date:	1 st April 2025			
Lifespan:	April 1 st 2025 onwards			
Date of next review:	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The pricing of MOT's and Taxi testing does not have any impact on the rights of an individual, therefore proposed savings do not adversely affect this. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Equality Act 2010 requires that the impact of recommendations is considered as part of the decision-making process. The Act requires that the Council must have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. •Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. •Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. <p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic •take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; •encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. <p>The price of MOT and taxi testing does not have any impact on particular groups or individuals, so the proposed increase will not affect any groups or individuals in particular and there are no concerns that the proposal could disproportionately impact on a group or individuals because they hold one or more protected characteristics.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process. 30% (106 people) of respondents supported the proposal, compared to 18% (63 people) who were opposed. No concerns were identified in the consultation that the proposal could disproportionately adversely impact on one or more of the protected characteristics.</p>

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

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The price of MOT testing and taxi testing does not have any impact on particular communities, so the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
Armed Forces Could the decision impact negatively on those who are currently members of the armed forces or former members in the areas of Council delivered healthcare, compulsory education and housing policies?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The price of MOT testing and taxi testing does not have any impact on members of the armed forces, or former members in the areas of Council delivered healthcare, compulsory education and housing policies so the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
Care leavers Could the decision impact negatively on those who are care experienced?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The price of MOT testing and taxi testing does not have any impact on care leavers, the proposed increase does not affect any community in particular. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current service provision and feedback from the consultation process.
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.				

Assessment completed by:	Chris Bates	Head of Service:	Chris Bates
Date:	09/1/2025	Date:	09/1/2025