

Report of the Chief Officer – Financial Services

Report to Executive Board

Date: 21st October 2020

Subject: Revenue budget update 2021/22 and budget savings proposals

Are specific electoral wards affected? If yes, name(s) of ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Has consultation been carried out?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will the decision be open for call-in?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, access to information procedure rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary

Main issues

- The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 - 2025/26 considered at last month's Executive Board meeting reported an estimated budget gap of £166.3m for the period of the strategy, of which £118.8m relates to 2021/22. Of this £118.8m, £59.7m is due to pressures identified prior to the impact of COVID-19 with the balance of £59.1m resulting from the ongoing financial impact of COVID-19.
- In response to this financial position, the council has established a 'Financial Challenge' programme of service reviews to identify savings that will contribute towards closing the estimated budget gap and enable the authority to present a robust, balanced budget position in 2021/22. In line with the council's ambitions and values, these aim to protect services that support the most vulnerable whilst ensuring that the council becomes more financially resilient and sustainable for the future.
- The saving proposals resulting from these reviews are categorised as either 'Business as Usual' proposals which can be implemented within the council's delegated decision-making framework and without consultation, or 'Service Reviews' which will require meaningful consultation with relevant stakeholders prior to any decisions being taken. The results of any such consultation with staff, trade unions, service users and the public will be used to inform the final decision.
- An initial set of savings proposals for 2021/22 were approved at the September Executive Board meeting totalling £32.3m with an anticipated reduction in the workforce of 478.4 full-time equivalent (FTE) budgeted posts. Combined with a further

£0.3m savings resulting from a review of the capital programme and an additional reduction of 50 FTEs through a review of the Housing Revenue Account, the total impact of September's proposals is a revenue saving for 2021/22 of £32.6m with an anticipated reduction in the workforce of 528.4 FTEs.

- A further £7.9m potential savings are presented for consideration today with an anticipated reduction in the workforce of 88.7 full-time equivalent (FTE) budgeted posts. If today's proposals are approved, taken together with the £32.6m proposals approved at September's Executive Board, the total savings proposals identified so far of £40.5m will reduce the estimated budget gap for 2021/22 to £78.3m. The total anticipated reduction in the workforce is 617.1 FTEs. All efforts will be made to avoid compulsory redundancies.
- A further report will be brought to this Board in November in order to identify additional proposals to enable a balanced budget in 2021/22. The updated position, including any further Government announcements, will be reported to this Board in December through the Provisional Budget 2021/22.

1. Best Council Plan Implications (see the [latest version of the Best Council Plan](#))

- The Best Council Plan is the council's strategic plan which sets out its ambitions, outcomes and priorities for the city and the authority. These can only be delivered through a sound understanding of the organisation's longer-term financial sustainability which enables decisions to be made that balance the resource implications of the council's policies against financial constraints. This is the primary purpose of the Medium Term Financial Strategy which then provides the framework for the determination of the authority's annual revenue budgets.
- The Best Council Plan is generally updated each year alongside the Budget, with initial proposals brought to the Executive Board in December and a final draft considered at the following February meeting prior to formal approval at Full Council. Due to the current social, economic, political and financial uncertainties, compounded by COVID-19 and the end of the Brexit transition period, a more fundamental review of the Best Council Plan will be carried out next year that will take account of the latest socio-economic analysis. A refreshed strategic plan will be brought to this Board in September 2021 based on the three pillars of Inclusive Growth, Health and Wellbeing and tackling the Climate Emergency.

2. Resource Implications

- The savings proposals presented in this report will impact upon all the council's resources, including its staff, assets and finances. The financial implications are detailed in the report.

Recommendations

- Executive Board is requested to:
 - a) Note the financial position for 2021/22 outlined in this report and that further savings are required to deliver a balanced budget position;
 - b) Note the 'Business as Usual' savings and that decisions to give effect to them shall be taken by the relevant Director or Chief Officer in accordance with the Officer delegation scheme (Executive functions);
 - c) Agree the recommendations in the 'Service Review' proposals at Appendix 2b and that consultation commences. And to note that decisions to give effect to

them shall be taken by the relevant Director or Chief Officer, following the consultation period, in accordance with the Officer delegation scheme (Executive functions) save where the Leader or Director considers that the matter should be referred to Executive Board for consideration; and

- d) Note that the next Best Council Plan update will be brought to this Board in September 2021.

1. Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report details the actions underway and proposed to address the financial gap for 2021/22 which is currently estimated at £118.8m. The report presents a series of savings proposals to contribute to the council achieving a balanced budget for 2021/22 Budget and, where appropriate, seeks agreement to begin meaningful consultation with staff, trade unions, service users and the public as required.

2. Background information

- 2.1 A report received at this Board in June set out the impact that the COVID-19 pandemic is having upon the council's financial position in 2020/21 and 2021/22. Updates have since been provided to the Executive Board on the 2020/21 position through monthly Financial Health reports. The latest Financial Health report is included on today's agenda and now projects an overspend in this financial year of £51.5m at Month 5.
- 2.2 The Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 to 2025/26 received at this Board in September further detailed the significant financial uncertainties resulting from COVID-19 and how this will continue to impact upon the council's financial position for the period covered by the strategy. The report also noted the significant increase in Government borrowing as a result of the pandemic. Plans to address the increasing Government deficit – and what this means for local government – will be outlined in the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review which, Government has recently announced, will now proceed without an Autumn Budget.
- 2.3 The Council's financial position and the estimated budget gap for the period covered by the Medium Term Financial Strategy need to be seen against a backdrop of ongoing national economic uncertainty, which means the council will continue to have to make some difficult decisions on how and where it allocates its capital and revenue resources in order to deliver its priorities as set out in the Best Council Plan.
- 2.4 With regard to 2021/22, the authority's estimated financial gap is £118.8m. To start to reduce that gap, an initial set of savings proposals were considered and approved by this Board at its September meeting (available at Item 43 [here](#)). Today's report presents a second set of proposals for consideration.

3. Main issues

Revenue Budget 2021/22: Service reviews

- 3.1 A 'Financial Challenge' programme of service reviews has been established to identify savings that will contribute towards closing the estimated revenue budget gap and enable the authority to present a balanced budget position in 2021/22. These comprise several cross-council reviews and others that relate to individual services; a small number of more complex reviews have received external, independent support.

- The cross-council reviews include those relating to activities that the council has been pursuing for some time, such as a review of business administration, mail and print expenditure reduction and changing the workplace. More recently identified reviews include reducing the wage bill, estate rationalisation (building on the long-standing changing the workplace programme), procurement, customer contact and workforce development. The report, 'Estate Realisation and Accelerated Capital Receipts' was considered at last month's Executive Board meeting (Item 46 available [here](#)) with a further update elsewhere on today's agenda.
- In addition to the cross-council reviews, directorates have also carried out reviews of all services, working towards an indicative target saving of 10% of gross expenditure or 20% of net expenditure for each directorate.

3.2 The Financial Challenge programme is being carried out across all services with a cross-council 'Silver' group set up to provide support and ensure a co-ordinated, consistent approach. Directors have carried out peer reviews of each other's emerging proposals to provide additional high support and high challenge and Scrutiny Board working groups have also been set up to consider proposals brought to this Executive Board and for further support and challenge to identify new proposals.

3.3 The outcome from the reviews has led to a set of savings proposals which are categorised as either 'Business as Usual' (BAU) or 'Service Review' proposals:

- BAU proposals are those that do not require consultation to implement: for example, they relate to improving the efficiency of the service, are cost reduction measures with no impact on service users or, where there are budgeted staffing reductions, these are anticipated to be met through deletion of vacant posts or voluntary means, as has been collectively agreed. Where voluntary measures have a modest and/or residual impact on the workforce, local / BAU consultation would be expected.
- Service Review proposals (some cross-council, some service-specific) are those requiring consultation: for example, the way in which a service is delivered or the level of service provided is impacted and so meaningful consultation with service users is needed; and/or the proposal relates to a significant internal restructure, requiring consultation with trade unions and staff.

3.4 A summary of the BAU proposals is provided at Appendix 1. The total value of these proposals is £4.6m

3.5 The Service Review proposals are summarised at Appendix 2a with a total value of £3.3m. Executive summaries and equality, diversity, cohesion and integration screening documents for each Service Review proposal are also provided at Appendix 2b.

3.6 Any new savings identified from the cross-council reviews have been captured within the BAU and Service Review proposals.

3.7 The combined value of the BAU and Service Review proposals set out in today's report is £7.9m.

3.8 Further savings proposals to address the remaining estimated budget gap will be brought to this Board in November.

3.9 In additional, a strategic approach with regard to the level of savings which can be achieved in 2021/22 is currently being considered with further alternative measures

being explored that will take into account this autumn's Comprehensive Spending Review and subsequent local government provisional financial settlement in December.

General Fund: Revenue Budget 2021/22 - savings proposed

3.10 Table 1 summarises the proposals set out in this report for the Board's consideration.

Directorate	Business as Usual		Service reviews		Total	
	2021/22 savings / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts	2021/22 savings / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts	2021/22 savings / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Adults & Health	100	-3.0	1,656	0.0	1,756	-3.0
Children & Families	2,350	-13.0	0	0.0	2,350	-13.0
City Development	415	0.0	920	-33.2	1,335	-33.2
Communities & Environment	1,077	0.0	740	-25.4	1,817	-25.4
Resources & Housing	683	-14.1	0	0.0	683	-14.1
	4,625	-30.1	3,316	-58.6	7,941	-88.7

Table 1: Summary of 2021/22 Revenue Budget Savings Proposals

3.11 Should these proposals be approved, the estimated budget gap for 2021/22 would be reduced to £78.3m.

2021/22	£'m
Estimated budget gap	118.8
Capital programme review	
September Executive Board	-0.3
Savings proposals	
September Executive Board	-32.3
October Executive Board	-7.9
	-40.2
Revised estimated budget gap	78.3

Staffing implications

3.12 The implications of the savings proposals set out in today's report project a potential reduction of 88.7 FTE budgeted posts. Combined with the proposals approved at September's Executive Board meeting (528.4 FTE budgeted post reduction – including 50 HRA-funded FTE posts), the total potential reduction is 617.1 FTE budgeted posts.

3.13 The council issued a Section 188 Notice to the trade unions in June 2020 confirming our duty to consult and to avoid, reduce and mitigate the risk and consequences of compulsory redundancies. Pursuant to the council's Managing Staff Reductions Policy, a range of voluntary measures are now being progressed, including early retirement, flexible retirement, severance and other voluntary changes to working patterns. The expressions of interest in the voluntary leavers' scheme were very high and, following the scheme's closure at the end of September, decision-making is now taking place over October and November.

1,992 expressions of interest were received and of these, 1,051 colleagues have reaffirmed their interest in leaving under the Early Leavers' Initiative (ELI) scheme: 895 through voluntary retirement, 156 through voluntary severance. A collectively agreed framework has been established to ensure meaningful and frequent consultation with trade unions and staff.

- 3.14 Please also refer to the Reducing the Wage Bill paper within Appendix 2b to this report, which sets out proposals for some further measures to reduce staffing and workforce costs. There are predominantly two areas of intervention: reducing the number of posts through compulsory redundancies where this cannot be achieved solely via voluntary measures and reducing employment costs through changing terms and conditions of employment. The former focuses on senior structural change and the application of the organisational design principles (explained further as part of the Reducing the Wage Bill paper appended). The latter considers specific pay structures and enhancements at a local level that may support the delivery of service reviews.

4. Corporate considerations

4.1 Consultation and engagement

- 4.1.1 Senior officers and elected members have been engaged in developing the savings proposals set out in today's report. Trade unions have also been informed in headline terms of the emerging proposals. Where required, further consultation and engagement will be carried out with staff, trade unions, service users and the public as appropriate on the Service Review proposals set out at Appendix 2. Scrutiny Boards will also be considering the proposals as relevant to their remits through their October meetings. The outcomes of any consultation will inform the council's decision-making and be incorporated into the 2021/22 to 2023/24 Budget Report timetabled for initial consideration at December's Executive Board.

4.2 Equality and diversity / cohesion and integration

- 4.2.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to have "due regard" to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote equality of opportunity. The law requires that the duty to pay "due regard" be demonstrated in the decision making process. Assessing the potential equality impact of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which public authorities can show due regard.
- 4.2.2 The council is fully committed to ensuring that equality and diversity are given proper consideration when we develop policies and make decisions. In order to achieve this, the council has an agreed process in place and has particularly promoted the importance of the process when taking forward key policy or budgetary changes. Equality impact assessments also ensure that we make well informed decisions based on robust evidence.
- 4.2.3 Equality impact screenings have been carried out on the service review savings proposals and included with those proposals at Appendix 2. Where appropriate, equality impact assessments will be carried out as part of the decision-making process.

4.3 Council policies and the Best Council Plan

- 4.3.1 The Best Council Plan sets out the council's ambitions, outcomes and priorities for the organisation and the city, many delivered in partnership. The current plan is therefore aligned with both the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and its annual budget. To help mitigate the pressures on the financial sustainability of the council – significantly exacerbated by the impacts of COVID-19 - it is imperative that the proposals contained in this report are considered in order that the council's strategic priorities can be delivered within a robust financial framework.
- 4.3.2 The Best Council Plan is generally reviewed on an annual basis and updated as required. In recent years, initial proposals have been brought to this Board in December with a final draft updated Plan proceeding in the following February, then to Full Council for approval, in line with the Budget process and timescales. This year was different due to the pandemic: the 2020 to 2025 update was approved at Full Council in February 2020 and was due to be launched on 1st April. However, the launch was delayed to allow time to better understand the effects of COVID-19. As such, a revised Plan was launched in the summer, reflecting the very changed context and signposting a more fundamental review next year. (The current Best Council Plan and supporting Financial Strategy 2020 to 25 and People Strategy 2020 to 2025 are available on the council's website [here](#).)
- 4.3.3 This fundamental review will take place over the coming months with the aim of publishing an updated strategic plan – based on the three pillars of Inclusive Growth, Health and Wellbeing and tackling the Climate Emergency - in September 2021 that will then provide the framework for the development of the council's 2022/23 Budget. This will allow time for a better understanding of the medium- to longer-term impacts of COVID-19 and the end of the Brexit transition period on the economy, communities and individuals; and also further clarity on the council's financial position and government policy and spending. In the interim, a range of socio-economic analysis has been, and will be, carried out to inform the next Best Council Plan: this includes the introductory context within the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 – 2024/25 considered at last month's Executive Board (Item 42 [here](#)); the Leeds Economic Recovery Framework elsewhere on this meeting's agenda; and an updated Leeds Joint Strategic Assessment¹ in 2021.

Climate Emergency

- 4.3.4 There are no specific implications for the climate emergency resulting from this report.

4.4 Resources, procurement and value for money

- 4.4.1 All resources, procurement and value for money implications are considered in the summary and main body of the report.

4.5 Legal implications, access to information, and call-in

¹ Health and Wellbeing Boards have a responsibility for carrying out a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), through which they assess the current and future health, care and wellbeing needs of their communities in order to shape priorities and inform local commissioning and decision making. In Leeds, over the last decade we have adopted a wider approach: using the city's asset-based philosophy, we carry out a Joint Strategic Assessment (JSA) to understand the wider determinants of health, including the economy and environment. The last JSA was carried out in 2018 and is available on the Leeds Observatory [here](#), supported by a range of specialised needs assessments.

- 4.5.1 Decisions giving effect to the Business as Usual proposals included in this report can be taken by the relevant Director or Chief Officer in accordance with the Officer Scheme of delegation (Executive functions) and will be subject to the Executive and decision – making procedure rules. Notice of any decision which is “Key” will be published on the list of forthcoming decision not less than 28 clear calendar days in advance of the date of the proposed decision.
- 4.5.2 Decisions giving effect to the Service Reviews will be made following the outcome of consultation having regard to representations made. Decisions will be taken by the relevant Director or Chief Officer following the procedure set out in paragraph 4.5.1 above, save where the Leader or the relevant Portfolio Holder has directed or the Director considers that the matter should be referred to Executive Board for consideration.
- 4.5.3 As a decision of Executive Board, the recommendations in this report are eligible for call-in.

4.6 Risk management

- 4.6.1 The financial projections for 2021/22 contain a number of inherent risks even without taking account of the impact of COVID-19. These include risks associated with budgets which are subject to fluctuating demand and demographic pressures and key income budgets that rely upon the number of users of a service. In addition the approved Budget makes assumptions in respect of the level of resources that are receivable through council tax, business rates and government grants.
- 4.6.2 Factoring in the impact of COVID-19, the financial position for 2021/22 makes a number of assumptions around income, expenditure and collection rates for both Business Rates and Council Tax – the pandemic will continue to affect the levels that can be collected. Any variations from these assumptions has implications for the level of resources available to the council to fund services.
- 4.6.3 There also remain uncertainties around the impacts of the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review due to take place this autumn, business rates reform and Fair Funding Review and Government's intentions for the future funding of social care.
- 4.6.4 These risks and assumptions will be subject to review as more information becomes available and through the council's financial management, monitoring and reporting processes.
- 4.6.5 This report contains several budget saving proposals that will be subject to consultation. There remains a risk that there is slippage in the implementation of these proposals or that the assumptions contained in these proposals change as a result of the consultation exercises. This could lead to a variation to the assumed level of savings and the council's ability to set a balanced budget for 2021/22.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 The council faces an unprecedented financial challenge with an estimated budget gap for 2021/22 of £118.8m. In response, the authority has carried out a review of its capital programme and established a 'Financial Challenge' programme of service reviews to identify savings that will contribute towards closing the estimated budget gap and enable the authority to present a robust, balanced budget position in 2021/22. These aim to protect services that support the most vulnerable whilst

ensuring that the organisation becomes more financially resilient and sustainable for the future.

- 5.2 Thus far, £40.5m of savings have been identified through the reviews (£32.6m approved at September's Executive Board meeting, including £0.3m from the capital programme review, and a further £7.9m for consideration through this report). The £40.5m would reduce the estimated gap for next year from £118.8m to £78.3m. Work continues to identify further savings with proposals to come to this Board in November.
- 5.3 Meaningful consultation will be carried out with staff, trade unions, service users and the public on proposals as required with the results used to inform the decisions taken in respect of Service Reviews.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1 Executive Board is requested to:
- a) Note the financial position for 2021/22 outlined in this report and that further savings are required to deliver a balanced budget position;
 - b) Note the 'Business as Usual' savings and that decisions to give effect to them shall be taken by the relevant Director or Chief Officer in accordance with the Officer delegation scheme (Executive functions);
 - c) Agree the recommendations in the 'Service Review' proposals at Appendix 2b and that consultation commences. And to note that decisions to give effect to them shall be taken by the relevant Director or Chief Officer, following the consultation period, in accordance with the Officer delegation scheme (Executive functions) save where the Leader or Director considers that the matter should be referred to Executive Board for consideration; and
 - d) Note that the next Best Council Plan update will be brought to this Board in September 2021.

7. Background documents²

None.

² The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

Appendix 1: 'Business as Usual' 2021/22 savings proposals

Table 1: Adults & Health Directorate		
Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Proposed saving through closure of Osmondthorpe Resource Centre (closed since start of pandemic); services retained via other day care hubs and will continue to monitor operation of revised service model.	100	-3.0
Total 'BAU' Adults & Health 2021/22 savings	100	-3.0

Table 2: Children & Families Directorate		
Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Children & Families services: seeking appropriate Health funding	1,700	0.0
Reductions in operational running costs across the directorate	150	0.0
Savings through the Early Leavers' Initiative across the directorate	500	-13.0
Total 'BAU' Children & Families 2021/22 savings	2,350	-13.0

Table 3: City Development Directorate		
Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
15% reduction in grants to Leeds Grand Theatre, Opera North, Northern Ballet and Leeds Playhouse. 15% reduction in grant to Henry Moore Institute pending a refresh of the partnership.	227	0.0
Cessation of the annual Christmas Lights switch-on event, and removal of budget to support bi-annual international football screenings on Millennium Square	88	0.0
Cessation of funding contribution to Yorkshire Sport Foundation and for PE/school sport. Cessation of partnership with British Cycling, including the annual <i>Let's Ride</i> event.	100	0.0

Table 3: City Development Directorate

Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
15% (£300k) reduction in grant to Leeds Culture Trust (Leeds 2023). This will contribute a total saving of £1.35m over 3 years. The Trust will still aim for a transformational cultural year as a pillar of the post-Covid Leeds and west Yorkshire economic recovery, and is committed to attracting a further c£20m of investment to the project and the city.	300	0.0
Offset of budget pressure already built into council's medium-term financial strategy	(300)	0.0
Total 'BAU' City Development 2021/22 savings	415	0.0

Table 4: Communities and Environment Directorate

Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Proposal to increase the charge made to residents for the replacement of black and brown bins to cover the administrative and delivery costs involved. This revised charge would represent 57% of the actual cost to the council	40	0.0
Proposal to increase the charge for bulky waste collections from £20 to £30 to contribute to the costs of administration, collection and disposal of up to four unwanted bulky items	70	0.0
5% increase in bereavement fees - this is an additional 2% on top of the 3% (£220k) proposal considered by Executive Board in September	147	0.0
Recognising that community committees will experience an increase in funds delegated to them over the next three years it is proposed to reduce the wellbeing budget by 15%. Even with this reduction we estimate a £2m increase in spending power over the next 3 years.	195	0.0
Removal of council subsidy for Police and Community Support Officers (PCSOs) uplift in line with other West Yorkshire local authorities	625	0.0
Total 'BAU' Communities & Environment 2021/22 savings	1,077	0.0

Table 5: Resources & Housing Directorate

Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Democratic Services savings through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capturing efficiencies arising from new ways of working adopted by elected members; • Operational savings from previously underspent budgets; and • Deletion of funded vacant posts and agreement to expressions of interest under the ELI scheme (with functions being accommodated through consolidation into remaining establishment with no significant changes in current support to members) 	183	-3.2
Civic Enterprise Leeds: price rise (4p) for school meals	300	0.0
Civic Enterprise Leeds: staffing reductions through voluntary means based on reduced cleaning and catering at decommissioned adult social care residential homes - <i>please refer to Adults & Health service review proposal to decommission two adult social care residential homes</i>	200	-10.9
Total 'BAU' Resources & Housing 2021/22 savings	683	-14.1

Table 6: Total 'BAU' 2021/22 savings proposals

Directorate	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Adults and Health	100	-3.0
Children & Families	2,350	-13.0
City Development	415	0.0
Communities & Environment	1,077	0.0
Resources & Housing	683	-14.1
Total	4,625	-30.1

Appendix 2a: Summary Service Review Proposals *(please refer to Appendix 2b for reports and equality screenings on each proposal)*

Table 1: Adults & Health Directorate		
Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Proposal to decommission two adult social care residential homes: Homelea House in Rothwell and Richmond House in Farsley	420	0.0
Proposal to increase client contributions for adult social care services, maintaining means-testing	1,236	0.0
Total Adults & Health 2021/22 savings proposals requiring consultation	1,656	0.0

Table 2: Children & Families Directorate		
Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
No proposals. <i>Please note: the council is carrying out a whole system review of Children and Families Early Help and Preventative Services. This is a longer-term strategic review that is anticipated to deliver savings in 2022/23 and beyond.</i>	0	0.0
Total Children & Families 2021/22 savings proposals requiring consultation	0	0.0

Table 3: City Development Directorate		
Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Planning applications: proposed savings through staffing reductions via voluntary means and procedural efficiencies; also opportunities for additional income generation	100	-2.0
Proposal to reduce opening hours at Lotherton Hall with trade union, staff and public consultation.	67	-5.2
Proposal to reduce opening hours at Thwaite Mills Museum with trade union, staff and public consultation	70	-5.1
Proposal to carry out consultation with young people on the introduction of an annual charge of £3 for Breezecard to cover administrative costs, with appropriate concessions	150	0.0

Table 3: City Development Directorate		
Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Proposed reduced programme and new delivery model for Leeds Lights with trade union, staff and public consultation	208	-9.0
Proposal to withdraw from the service level agreement to support Chippendale Pool with trade union, staff and public consultation	37	-5.6
Proposal to close Yeadon Tarn Sailing Centre with trade union, staff and public consultation	88	-4.8
Proposal to deliver operating efficiencies within John Charles Centre for Sport, increase fees and reduce staffing, with trade union and staff consultation	200	-1.5
Total City Development 2021/22 savings proposals requiring consultation	920	-33.2

Table 4: Communities and Environment Directorate		
Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Proposed closure of Otley (Ellar Ghyll) household waste and recycling centre. Staff affected would be redeployed to vacancies on other sites or elsewhere in the service.	110	-2.0
Proposal to carry out public consultation on closure of West Leeds Country Park visitor centre in Pudsey Park, also with trade union and staff consultation. There is a potential opportunity to repurpose or replace the existing buildings with a park café that could retain some of the educational elements of the visitor centre. This would require a business case for unsupported borrowing.	90	-2.0
Proposal to carry out stakeholder consultation on 50% reduction in the number of bowling greens supported by the council, with consideration to community asset transfers. Staffing reductions anticipated through voluntary means.	83	-4.5
Proposal to carry out stakeholder consultation on review of opening hours and staffing rotas within Community Hub / Library provision across the city, with associated trade union and staff consultation on staffing reductions	457	-16.9
Total Communities & Environment 2021/22 savings proposals requiring consultation	740	25.4

Table 5: Resources & Housing Directorate

Proposal	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Cross-council review: reducing the wage bill – <i>Budget savings and FTE reductions from this accounted for within directorate budgets through service reviews and voluntary schemes (notably early leavers' initiative and flexible retirement)</i>	0	0
Total Resources & Housing 2021/22 savings proposals requiring consultation	0	0

Table 6: Total proposals requiring consultation for 2021/22 savings

Directorate	2021/22 saving / £'000s	FTE budgeted posts
Adults and Health	1,656	0.0
Children & Families	0	0.0
City Development	920	-33.2
Communities & Environment	740	-25.4
Resources & Housing	0	0.0
Total	3,316	-58.6



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Shona McFarlane/Debbie Ramskill

Report of: Cath Roff, Director Adults & Health

Portfolio: Health, Wellbeing & Adults

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Care Delivery Transformation – care homes
2021/22 savings from proposal	£0.420m (FYE £1.531m)

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

The Council is facing financial challenges unlike anything in the past, and in addition, the financial impact of the Covid-19 pandemic is unprecedented. All parts of the Council have to look carefully at the cost of all our services and put forward options to support the reduction of the financial gap and to help build financial resilience over the next five years. The challenging financial context for local authorities has been further impacted by COVID-19, and we recognise the need for the most efficient and effective model of services to make the Leeds pound go further. As such, it is timely to review in-house service provision and consider future options as part of the Council's medium term financial strategy.

The Better Lives strategy is the Council's strategy for people with care and support needs. A key aspect of this strategy over recent years has been a strategic review to transform the Council's in-house service for older people. The main drivers for these proposals are:

- The aspiration of older people to have a wider choice of appropriate accommodation and support options with, as much as possible, support being delivered in their own homes or in care environments like extra care housing.
- The challenging financial context for local authorities which has been further impacted by COVID-19, and the need for the most efficient and effective model of services to make the Leeds pound go further
- The need for significant capital investment in these two buildings.
- The impact of older people exercising choice on the occupancy levels in the two care homes and therefore the unit cost of services

Previous reports to both Executive and Scrutiny Boards as part of the Better Lives Programme have documented how the aspirations of people with care and support needs have changed over time and that there is a strong and increasing desire to remain living in one's own home for as long as possible. As such a key aspect of the *Better Lives* strategy has been a continuous review of the Council's in-house services for older people with the focus being on how they meet both current expectations and crucially how they can contribute to maximising people's independence, recovery and rehabilitation in the future.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



The reviews evidenced that demand for traditional forms of residential care for older people have continued to reduce with a switch to greater demand for models of care that provide housing-with-support such as extra care housing. This has meant that between 2011 and 2016 a number of in-house care homes closed.

The total saving of decommissioning Home Lea House and Richmond House is estimated at £1.531m, in a full year. The part year saving in 21/22 is estimated to be £0.420m.

Home Lea House

Home Lea House is a 29 bedded long-stay residential home situated in Rothwell. There are two in-house care homes in Rothwell and Home Lea House is the older of the two homes which is why it has been put forward for closure. The current occupancy at Home Lea House is 25 (86%). The current gross budget is £789k and the net budget is £547k. In a full year it would be possible to save the gross budget of £789k as the client income will follow the client. Closing this facility from 1st February 2022 would save £789k by the end of 2022/23. The one-off costs of the assessment and transitions social work team and of alternative independent provision (for those taking up on the care guarantee) would need to be offset against these savings.

Proposed option: To request approval from Executive Board to commence consultation on the proposal to decommission the service, based on national data which supports the view that people are being supported to live independently and safely in their own homes and communities for longer. The need for residential homes is decreasing within Leeds and where this resource is required to meet people's needs, there is a well-developed independent sector care home market. Following concerted work by the Council's Care Quality Team from 2017 the number of residential care homes rated good or outstanding is now 84%.

Following detailed consultation with all those affected by the proposal, the consultation findings would be analysed and a report with the findings and recommendations would be made to Executive Board in June 2021. If a recommendation for decommissioning was made and approved then any adverse impacts of the change would need to be lessened and potentially removed through putting in place a range of mitigating actions. These actions would include the following:

- An Assessment and Transitions social work team to be established to undertake assessments of the people living in the care home and to support them and their families / carers to find and move to suitable alternative provision.
- Implementation of the Leeds-specific Care Guarantee which outlines the principles that customers affected by the closure could expect from the Council to ensure their dignity, choice and rights were protected.
- People who do not have the capacity to make an informed decision to be given access to an independent advocate.
- Risk assessments to be carried out to ensure that clinical and therapeutic needs of those directly affected are responded to urgently and with sensitivity.

The estimated timescales for a full decommissioning and ensuring all customers are appropriately transferred to a new home of their choice is approximately 12 months from the onset of a formal consultation, anticipated in this proposal as no earlier than end January 2022.

Richmond House

Richmond House is a 20 bedded residential service situated in Farsley. The current service offer is short term care and support to people who require a period of recovery following a hospital admission. The service also offers support to people from the community to prevent hospital admission. The average occupancy over the last year is 12 (60%). The current gross and net budget is £742k. There is no associated income from short term clients. The part year saving from closure on 1st November 2021 would amount to £309k, with the full



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



saving of £742k in 2022/23. The one-off costs of the assessment and transitions social work team and of any potential alternative independent provision would need to be offset against these savings.

Proposed option: To request approval from Executive Board to commence consultation on the proposal to decommission the service based on occupancy and the need for this type of service across the city. Leeds has a range of services to meet the needs of people who require some type of intervention to either support them to reach their optimum with therapeutic and recovery focused support to return home or to undertake an assessment to support their longer term needs. The CCG Community Care Beds contract is now established and provides a greater recovery residential and nursing offer. As such Richmond House is continually under occupied and the current type of provision can easily be assimilated in wider system provision.

A formal minimum consultation period would be required, however everyone who receives a service at Richmond House either returns to their own home, is supported to bid for rehousing or moves to longer term care. Average length of stay is three and a half weeks. The Adults & Health social work teams support and facilitate appropriate moves for people with the assessed level of care package.

The estimated timescales for full decommissioning and ensuring all customers are appropriately transferred is approximately 9 months from the onset of a formal consultation, anticipated in this proposal as no earlier than 1st November 2021.

Impacts of proposal

The service will, wherever possible, seek to avoid any unintended consequences of any proposals developed, though current customers and family carers would be affected by these proposed options. There would be minimum disruption to the customers currently residing at Richmond House, however there would be a more significant change for customers currently residing at Home Lea House and their family carers. In addition staff would be affected, particularly women who make up a very large proportion of the workforce. This proposal would also affect approximately 60 staff. Adult social care has received a high number of ELI requests from across in-house services which offers significant potential to redeploy staff and avoid redundancies. If this proposal is agreed a full EDCI assessment on organisational change will consider impacts on staff.

We are aware from previous work to decommission services that the following is very important to people:

- Alternative provision is of a similar nature and quality
- Alternative provision is local
- Keep friends together
- Keep the homes open and cease permanent admissions allowing current customers to remain (however the Council has two residential homes in Rothwell - Dolphin Manor will remain open and could be an appropriate alternative for individuals at Home Lea House
- Good communication with staff to include good HR advice in relation to future options

Recommendation(s)

Members are requested to:

- Approve the request to consult on the proposal to decommission Home Lea House residential care home, situated in Rothwell.
- Approve the request to consult on the proposal to decommission Richmond House residential short term care and support service, situated in Farsley.
- To approve the proposal going out to consultation as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

The responsible individual for delivery of this proposal is Cath Roff, Director Adults & Health with support from Shona McFarlane, Deputy Director Social Work & Social Care Services and Debbie Ramskill, Head of Service.

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: Adults & Health	Service area: Care Delivery, A&H
Lead person: Debbie Ramskill	Contact number: 0113 3367709

1. Title: Care Delivery Transformation Service Review

Is this a:

☐

Strategy / Policy

☒

Service / Function

☐

Other

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

This EDCI is screening the request to Executive Board to approve the following;

- Approve the request to consult on the proposal to decommission Home Lea House residential care home, situated in Rothwell.
- Approve the request to consult on the proposal to decommission Richmond House residential short term care and support service, situated in Farsley.
- To approve the proposal going out to consultation as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	X	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?	X	
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?	X	
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment • Advancing equality of opportunity • Fostering good relations 	X	

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

The Executive Board report summaries those groups who would be affected by the proposals; in particular the residents and their families / carers, and staff who provide the care and support.

Women make up a very large proportion of the workforce. This proposal would affect approximately 60 staff.

A full EDCI assessment will be carried out upon a decision by Executive Board to approve the proposals. In addition a full EDCI on organisational change will consider

impacts on staff.

- **Key findings**

(**think about** any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

Full EDCI to be carried out.

- **Actions**

(**think about** how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

Full EDCI to be carried out.

5. If you are *not* already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you *will need to carry out an impact assessment*.

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	November 2020 (subject to Executive Board decision).
Date to complete your impact assessment	December 2020
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	Debbie Ramskill, Head of Service, Care Delivery

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Shona MacFarlane	Chief Officer	30/09/2020
Date screening completed		30/09/2020

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:	
For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent: 01/10/2020
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Amy Travis, Project Leader/ Steve Hume, Chief Officer Resources & Strategy

Report of: Cath Roff, Director Adults & Health

Portfolio: Health, Wellbeing & Adults

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	<i>Increase in Client Contributions</i>
2021/22 savings from proposal	£1,236,000

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	No
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

The Adult Social Care Service commissions and provides a range of Community Based Services to eligible clients in meeting their Social Care needs. Under the Care Act Adult Social Care also have the power to levy a financial contribution towards the cost of that care from those individuals in accordance with a broad framework laid down by government. This broad framework is based upon a series of criteria, affording some local discretion, but reflects an overriding principle recognising the clients ability to pay based upon their individual financial circumstances. Leeds currently receives approximately £16m in income from Charges for Community Based Services (i.e. excluding Residential Services).

Leeds has traditionally been a local authority which has set its charges and criteria for financial contributions at or below the average of other local authorities. In more recent years, culminating in the most recent Charging Review in 2015, the Council's charges and contributions levels were increased to the average of other local authorities at that time. Nevertheless, recent benchmarking has indicated that Leeds receives a much lower level of comparative income when compared to other local authorities. Whilst some of this gap has been closed in recent years through the tightening up of systems and processes and for which budget action plans have been set and achieved, there remain areas where we remain more generous than our comparators. This report focusses on 3 of these areas:

- Increasing the Maximum Assessed Charge (MAC). The MAC charge is effectively the maximum charge that a client can pay towards their care. The MAC charge in Leeds is currently set at £476 per week.
- Charging for the Cost of Care where care is provided by two carers at the same time. Where a person receives care/support requiring two individuals to provide this, the current charge is based only upon the costs of one carer. This is not only not in compliance with the current charging policy which requires the charge to reflect to full cost of the service, but is also out of parity with those people receiving their support as a Direct Payment whose contribution is based upon the value of the Direct Payment, including where applicable the cost of paying for two carers.
- Charging for financial services provided to clients as an Appointee. There are a significant and growing number of clients who both lack capacity and are at risk of abuse in relation to the administration of



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



their financial affairs. The Council currently provides an Appointee service to approximately 700 clients, of which 200 have account credit balances in excess of £1,000. The majority of other local authorities make a charge for these services.

Impacts of proposal

Service Users & Savings Levels

The impact of raising or removing the MAC charge would be that a small number (16) of clients would pay a considerably higher contribution to their care costs in accordance with their ability to pay. Increasing the MAC charge to the level of the current residential care framework fee (£595) would generate approximately £76k. Removing the MAC charge completely would generate approximately £210k

The impact of charging clients the full cost of care involving two carers would increase the charges payable by those clients (206), but would resolve the current inequity in terms of charging policy. This proposal is estimated to deliver an additional £1m in income.

As the above proposals would constitute a change to the current Adult Social Care Charging Policy there would be a requirement for a formal Service User Consultation prior to any decision being taken to implement.

Recommendation(s)

Members of Executive Board are recommended to agree to consult with service users on the following options:

- Raising of the MAC Charge to the full cost of a Framework Residential Placement within the financial assessment.
- Removing the MAC Charge from financial assessments.
- Charging for the full cost of care where two carers are required to provide the care.
- Implementing a charge of £5 per person per week where the Council acts as an Appointee on behalf of a client and the client has over £1,000 in funds in their account, together with a separate charge of £300 for administering the sale of a property via a solicitor on behalf of the client.

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: Adults & Health	Service area: Resources & Strategy, A&H
Lead person: Steve Hume	Contact number: 0113 37 83884

1. Title: Increase in Client Contributions

Is this a:

☒ **Strategy / Policy** ☐ **Service / Function** ☐ **Other**

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

This EDCI is screening the request to Members of Executive Board to agree to consult with service users on the following options:

- Raising of the MAC Charge to the full cost of a Framework Residential Placement within the financial assessment.
- Removing the MAC Charge from financial assessments.
- Charging for the full cost of care where two carers are required to provide the care.
- Implementing a charge of £5 per person per week where the Council acts as an Appointee on behalf of a client and the client has over £1,000 in funds in their account, together with a separate charge of £300 for administering the sale of a property via a solicitor on behalf of the client.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	X	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?	X	
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment• Advancing equality of opportunity• Fostering good relations		X

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

The Executive Board report summaries those groups who would be affected by the proposals; in particular the residents and their families / carers, and staff who provide the

care and support.

The proposals will likely have a negative financial impact for a number of current service users and their families/or carers across all social care client groups.

A full EDCI assessment will be carried out upon a decision by Executive Board to approve the proposals. In addition a full EDCI on organisational change will consider impacts on staff.

- **Key findings**

(**think about** any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

Full EDCI to be carried out.

- **Actions**

(**think about** how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

Full EDCI to be carried out.

5. If you are *not* already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you *will need to carry out an impact assessment*.

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	November 2020 (subject to Executive Board decision).
Date to complete your impact assessment	December 2020
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	Amy Travis Project Leader, Adults and Health

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Steve Hume	Chief Officer	08/10/2020
Date screening completed		07/10/2020

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent: 08/10/2020
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Jonathan Carr, Head of Development Management

Report of: David Feeney (Chief Planning Officer)

Portfolio: *Planning and Sustainable Development*

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Planning application decision making process
2021/22 savings from proposal	<i>£ 100k (circa)</i>

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Service Overview

The Development Management Service determines planning applications and guides planning proposals in the Leeds district; this is a statutory service. Application numbers stand at almost 5,000, with a higher than national average proportion of major applications, and around 2,500 other types of formal submission. As the second largest Planning Authority in the UK, the service is busy and often under significant workload pressures. However it is recognised as a high performing service, which exceeds statutory requirements, has high levels of member engagement and shows performance on national indicators higher than most of its Core City peers. The Chief Planning Officer (CPO) is authorised to discharge all applications apart from applications which are “exceptions” detailed in the CPO delegation agreement. The delegation level is around 98% in line with best practice for the effective and expeditious determination of planning applications, and is necessary given volume of applications received.

An externally supported review of current delivery arrangements has been undertaken with a focus on considering opportunities for change.

Review Outcomes

The service review themes centre on two main areas:

- Generating procedural efficiencies in associated technical support functions, particularly at the ‘front end’ of the application process. The review that identified considerable time is spent dealing with initially invalid submissions. A number of process changes and increased use of technology can minimise this cost whilst improving the service for users.
- Reducing the time and costs on decision making without changing the democratic safeguards in place. The costs of taking applications through Panel process were highlighted, as were the number that were presented were not an exception to the existing Scheme of Officer Delegation so requiring a Panel decision. Reducing the number of cases



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



to panel, which could also lead to less frequent or fewer panels (3 to 2 Panels recommended), could generate significant savings in officer time and in expenditure (on for example site visit minibus hire)

Review Impacts

Potential impacts of the review include:

- Reduced staffing levels. This will be managed through voluntary means by ELI and vacancies to minimise the impact on existing staff and customers
- Improved capacity of officers to pursue income generation opportunities with a more responsive and attractive offer on discretionary advice
- Maintenance of democratic oversight, as Members remain involved in the applications which should be determined by exception – the current scheme of delegation would remain as at present.
- Quicker but still high quality decisions, whether delegated or by Panel, with increased automation
- No negative impact for communities as the opportunities for democratic involvement remains the same

A consequential restructure would allow resources to be deployed to ensure financial stability of the service through additional income generation opportunities. However, given the existing service pressures, the staff savings can only be realised if the process and procedural changes are implemented.

A further consideration is the Government's recent consultation a further raft of planning reforms. The proposals to 'streamline' the planning system there may reduce planning application fee income due the increased use of permitted development rights; however the consultation recognises that well-resourced planning authorities will be still required to operate to reformed system. In terms of discretionary income, developers and applicants will still seek advice on proposals and acceptability against design codes and other parameters. The full impact of the government changes will need to be assessed as more detail emerges.

Recommendation(s)

- To note the outcomes of the Service Review
- To note the need for adherence to existing service process, procedures and internal controls in order to realise the overall staffing savings (c£100k for the Development Management service)
- To note the opportunity for greater income generation areas arising from a realignment of resources, inputs and process and procedural changes

The Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for implementation.

Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration screening – organisational change impacting on the workforce

As a public authority we need to ensure that all organisational change arrangements impacting on the workforce have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

Equality and diversity will always have relevancy to organisational changes which impact on a diverse workforce. If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration then you have already carried out an impact assessment.

A **screening** process is a short, sharp exercise, which completed at the earliest opportunity will help to determine:

- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and therefore
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Planning and Sustainable Development
Lead person: Jonathan Carr	Contact number: 0113 378 9480

1. Please provide a brief description of the organisational change arrangements that you are screening

This screening considers equality implications in terms of organisational change for an efficiency review for the Development Management function with Planning Services Group, in particular by considering impacts on staffing. The Development Management is at the front end of the Planning process, in applying the Councils' policies and priorities to planning applications and proposals received, in order to shape the character, development and prosperity of the City. It is a public facing service, with day to day contact with communities, organisations, developers and members and is high performing when compared to national targets and our Core City peers.

An Efficiency Review was undertaken over a 4 week period which considered the challenge of "improving the planning application decision-making process for citizens of Leeds at a reduced cost base".

The review highlighted that efficiency savings could be derived through process changes, increased use of technology and stricter adherence to existing protocols and procedures to improve the decision making process. Areas of focus were the front end of the planning process, where it was found that 50-60% of new applications are invalid on receipt, so

considerable time was spend requesting the additional information needed, Also the number of applications that were presented to Plans Panels (at many times the cost of a delegated decision) with no actual requirement in the constitution to do so was analysed. The review demonstrated potential staff time savings, allowing for some reduction in FTE and therefore the base budget, but also creating capacity for income generating activity. The refocus on statutory services and on discretionary advice that attracts fees may require some minor organisational changes but no fundamental structural changes.

However no changes to adopted public protocols, policy or the constitution are proposed.

2. Consideration of equality, diversity, cohesion and integration checklist

Questions	Yes	No
Have you already considered equality and diversity within your current and future planning?	x	
Where you have made consideration does this relate to the range of equality characteristics	x	
Have you considered positive and negative impacts for different equality characteristics	x	
Have you considered any potential barriers for different groups	x	
Have you used equality information and consultation where appropriate to develop your proposals	x	
Is there a clear plan of how equality areas identified for improvement will be addressed	x	

If you've answered **no** to the questions above, there may be gaps in your equality and diversity considerations and you should complete an equality and diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment (organisational change). Please go to **section 4**.

If you've answered **yes** to the questions above and believe you've already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 3**.

3. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate that you've considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?

(think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected.

The main users of the Development Management service are either applicants or third parties commenting on proposals. The changes in themselves do not affect planning policy or the outcomes of planning decisions and so do not require specific external consultation. The quality or outcomes of decision making will not be changed, rather the speed, efficiency and cost of making those decisions is addressed. The efficiency proposals aim to achieve at least £100k of savings to the base budget

The proposals will affect all staff with the service in adapting to new processes and approaches, but do not fundamentally alter the roles that staff undertake or the structure of the service. Existing protocols and formally adopted policies and procedures would remain unaltered. The increased automation and more efficient working practices would facilitate some reduction in FTE. It is anticipated that the reductions in FTE would arise from vacancy management and from the ELI. However, particular posts or individuals within them are not identified.

As part of the review, all staff within the service were surveyed for their views as to how savings could be achieved. In addition, a range of staff including some with protected characteristics were invited to have discussions with the reviewers to offer views on existing processes and suggested options for moving forward. The survey outcome and discussed were confidential and anonymised.

Key findings

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another).

Given the nature and complexity of the of the service it was not possible within the 4 week period of the Efficiency Review for detailed recommendations to be made; however, two main areas were highlighted,

(a) improvements to processes and operational efficiencies particularly through incorporation of digital and automation technology.

b) reducing the amount of work and cost by stricter adherence to existing protocols , with a focus on plans panel casework reduction and use of technology to assist the panel process

It was found that implementation of the options would lead to additional opportunities to generate income to help sustain the service, and ensure it is robust to future budget challenges in further increasing the surplus already generated.

Should the operational efficiencies outlined happen, it is considered that this will lead to more efficient use of officer time, create additional capacity and result in the service's ability to not fill vacant posts and facilitate consideration of ELI requests.

Where notable staffing changes or post reductions are proposed these will be in consultation with Development Management staff, Trade Unions, Senior Management Team, HR, service colleagues and the Executive Member.

In terms of the impact on staffing structures and individuals, this is not expected to be significant with teams and roles within them retained; however the response to the ELI offer is not yet fully known and so some realignment of resources may be required to accommodate requests where possible. Within any consideration and realignment of remaining resource, it will be important to ensure that no individual staff with protected characteristics are disadvantaged in any way.

The changes to increase the use of digital technology may be of benefit to staff in providing greater flexibility of working location, for example with less reliance on printing of documents. Those with mobility challenges or childcare issues will be able to take greater advantage of flexible working / working from home that has been successfully undertaken by the service during the pandemic.

Further there would be less need for staff to undertake physical site visits, with the development and integration of 3D software imagery and other software tools to enable virtual visits to be conducted.

During the implementation phase of the changes, training and support as needed and a wider consideration of impact on organisational service delivery will be carried out.

Actions

(think about how you'll promote positive impact and remove or reduce negative impact)

As mentioned earlier staff have been involved in the early discussions to produce the savings options. Where they relate to staffing levels or if restructuring, once formulated, any changes will be subject to further detailed discussions and consultation with staff. It will be vital that operational staff are part and parcel of the detailed service design work, to ensure it is fit for purpose by the end users and that staff feel fully included in the process of its development. Further equalities assessment will be undertaken as part of the formulation of more efficient processes.

There will be a need to ensure that the efficiencies and their implications are aligned with other services within the group such as Policy and Plans. Staff within that service will be invited to the service design workshops.

It is noted that Government have recently released a White Paper which proposes significant changes to the organisation of local planning authorities with an emphasis on Local Plans, design and place making, community participation and digital/GIS processes to enable better engagement.

Equality training and support for officers and members is important to ensure that due regard is given to all changes. Given the importance and emphasis being placed on digitisation of planning, any proposals need to continue to consider accessibility of not only for staff in the service but also the service users which includes the public, developers, members and other organisations.

4. If you're **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration **you'll need to carry out an impact assessment****

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

5. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Date screening completed		

6. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **executive board, full council, key delegated decisions** or a **significant operational decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- governance services will publish those relating to executive board and full council
- the appropriate directorate will publish those relating to delegated decisions and significant operational decisions
- a copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent

For executive board or full council – sent to governance services	Date sent:
For delegated decisions or significant operational decisions – sent to appropriate directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to the equality team	Date sent:

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Development Management Planning and Sustainable Development
Lead person: Jonathan Carr	Contact number: 0113 378 9480

1. Title:

Service review report

Is this a:

☐

Strategy / Policy

☒

Service / Function

☐

Other

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

This screening considers equality implications in terms of organisational change for an efficiency review for the Development Management function with Planning Services Group, in particular by considering impacts on staffing. The Development Management is at the front end of the Planning process, in applying the Councils' policies and priorities to planning applications and proposals received, in order to shape the character, development and prosperity of the City. It is a public facing service, with day to day contact with communities, organisations, developers and members and is high performing when compared to national targets and our Core City peers.

An Efficiency Review was undertaken over a 4 week period which considered the challenge of "improving the planning application decision-making process for citizens of Leeds at a reduced cost base".

The review highlighted that efficiency savings could be derived through process changes, increased use of technology and stricter adherence to existing protocols and procedures to improve the decision making process. Areas of focus were the front end

of the planning process, where it was found that 50-60% of new applications are invalid on receipt, so considerable time was spend requesting the additional information needed, Also the number of applications that were presented to Plans Panels (at many times the cost of a delegated decision) with no actual requirement in the constitution to do so was analysed. The review demonstrated potential staff time savings, allowing for some reduction in FTE and therefore the base budget, but also creating capacity for income generating activity. The refocus on statutory services and on discretionary advice that attracts fees may require some minor organisational changes but no fundamental structural changes.

However no changes to adopted public protocols, policy or the constitution are proposed.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	x	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	x	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?	x	
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?	x	
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment Advancing equality of opportunity Fostering good relations 		

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.

- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (**think about** the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

The main users of the Development Management service are either applicants or third parties commenting on proposals. The changes in themselves do not affect planning policy or the outcomes of planning decisions and so do not require specific external consultation. The quality or outcomes of decision making will not be changed, rather the speed, efficiency and cost of making those decisions is addressed.

For changes to processes and for the increase in digital technology, a potential impact has been identified on groups with little or no access to online services, or with inability to interact with digital platforms such as some elderly or vulnerable individuals e.g. for the submission of applications or making comments upon them.

The proposals will affect all staff with the service in adapting to new processes and approaches, but do not fundamentally alter the roles that staff undertake or the structure of the service. Existing protocols and formally adopted policies and procedures would remain unaltered. The increased automation and more efficient working practices would facilitate some reduction in FTE. It is anticipated that the reductions in FTE would arise from vacancy management and from the ELI. However, particular posts or individuals within them are not identified.

As part of the review, all staff within the service were surveyed for their views as to how savings could be achieved. In addition, a range of staff including some with protected

characteristics were invited to have discussions with the reviewers to offer views on existing processes and suggested options for moving forward. The survey outcome and discussed were confidential and anonymised.

- **Key findings**

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality

Given the nature and complexity of the of the service it was not possible within the 4 week period of the Efficiency Review for detailed recommendations to be made; however, two main areas were highlighted,

(a) improvements to processes and operational efficiencies particularly through incorporation of digital and automation technology.

b) reducing the amount of work and cost by stricter adherence to existing protocols , with a focus on plans panel casework reduction and use of technology to assist the panel process

It was found that implementation of the options would lead to additional opportunities to generate income to help sustain the service, and ensure it is robust to future budget challenges in further increasing the surplus already generated.

In terms of the impact on most individuals with protected characteristics, the limited scope of organisational change and limited external impact as described means that the impact is not anticipated be notable.

However the changes could reduce the opportunities for direct engagement with the service, through digital exclusion particularity of elderly or vulnerable individuals as mentioned above. (for mitigation see below)

In terms of changes to plans panels (reduction in number of applications presented) the impact on those protected characteristics will be limited, and if remote panel and webcasting is continued, there will in fact be increase in accessibility to those meetings.

Should the operational efficiencies outlined happen, it is considered that this will lead to more efficient use of officer time, create additional capacity and result in the service's ability to not fill vacant posts and facilitate consideration of ELI requests.

In terms of the impact on staffing structures and individuals, this is not expected to be significant with teams and roles within them retained; however the response to the ELI offer is not yet fully known and so some realignment of resources may be required to accommodate requests where possible. Within any consideration and realignment of remaining resource, it will be important to ensure that no individual staff with protected characteristics are disadvantaged in any way.

The changes to increase the use of digital technology may be of benefit to staff in providing greater flexibility of working location, for example with less reliance on printing of documents . Those with mobility challenges or childcare issues will be able to take

greater advantage of flexible working / working from home that has been successfully undertaken by the service during the pandemic.

Further there would be less need for staff to undertake physical site visits, with the development and integration of 3D software imagery and other software tools to enable virtual visits to be conducted.

During the implementation phase of the changes, training and support as needed and a wider consideration of impact on organisational service delivery will be carried out.

- **Actions**

(think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

To mitigate any negative impact of digital transformation, it is intended that applications will still be accepted on paper format, and that comments received by post will still be processed and taken into account. The intention is to increase the attractive off the digital offer to those that can utilise these functionality but not to exclude those that cannot, and who will continue to receive an equally high quality of service.

Further, all new platforms and outputs from software packages will be in an accessible format, with the use of PDF documents phased out.

Plans Panels whether held remotely or in person will continue to be webcast when possible

As mentioned earlier staff have been involved in the early discussions to produce the savings options. Where they relate to staffing levels or if restructuring, once formulated, any changes will be subject to further detailed discussions and consultation with staff. It will be vital that operational staff are part and parcel of the detailed service design work, to ensure it is fit for purpose by the end users and that staff feel fully included in the process of its development. Further equalities assessment will be undertaken as part of the formulation of more efficient processes.

There will be a need to ensure that the efficiencies and their implications are aligned with other services within the group such as Policy and Plans. Staff within that service will be invited to the service design workshops.

It is noted that Government have recently released a White Paper which proposes significant changes to the organisation of local planning authorities with an emphasis on Local Plans, design and place making, community participation and digital/GIS processes to enable better engagement.

Equality training and support for officers and members is important to ensure that due regard is given to all changes. Given the importance and emphasis being placed on digitisation of planning, any proposals need to continue to consider accessibility of not only for staff in the service but also the service users which includes the public,

developers, members and other organisations.

5. If you are **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment**.**

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:

Date to complete your impact assessment

Lead person for your impact assessment
(Include name and job title)

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name

Job title

Date

Date screening completed

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to
Governance Services

Date sent:

For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational
Decisions – sent to appropriate **Directorate**

Date sent:

All other decisions – sent to
equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk

Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Cluny Macpherson, Chief Officer, Culture and Sport

Report of: Martin Farrington, Director of City Development

Portfolios: Inclusive Growth and Culture

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Reduced opening hours at Lotherton Hall
2021/22 savings from proposal	£67,000

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

Lotherton Hall is part of Leeds Museums and Galleries (LMG), the largest local authority-run museum service in the country with one of the largest multidisciplinary collections in the UK totalling 1.3m objects - reflecting the city's industrial heritage and tradition of creativity, innovation and excellence. The collections are at the heart of the service's work to inspire school children, entertain families, support health and wellbeing, and celebrate shared heritage and local identities. In 2021 the service will celebrate 200 years since the collections were founded and the civic role of museums in the city began.

Lotherton Hall and Estate were presented to the people of Leeds in 1968 by Sir Alvary Gascoigne and have been open to the public since. The house arrived fully furnished and with its original contents of paintings, ceramics, furnishings, sculpture and silver. Up until the death of Lady Gascoigne in 1979 (the last member of family to live in the house) further family items were added. The Lotherton Endowment Fund was also provided by the family to enhance the collection, which now numbers some 2,700 items. Lotherton has the only dedicated Fashion Galleries in the region.

In addition the Hall displays the Savary collection of oriental ceramics, the Cooper furniture collection and 20th Century studio ceramics which form part of Leeds Museums and Galleries (LMG)'s Designated collections of decorative art (four of our collections are 'Designated' by the government meaning they are of national or international importance). The Hall provides key points of engagement with our collections for audiences and contribute their own narratives to the city's



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



histories. The Hall is an accredited museum, holds Visit England VAQAS status, and has received the Sandford Award quality mark for educational provision.

Until 2012/13 the Hall was operated by LMG with an admission charge and the wider park operated by Parks and Countryside with a separate car parking charge and free admission to the Bird Garden. In 2012/13 a new approach was developed by adopting a 'single estate' model, so that visitors paid once at the entrance to the estate. A joint project board was established with LMG and Parks & Countryside. The Estate and Hall host a range of events including the successful Lotherton Christmas Experience in association with Breeze, large-scale Yorkshire Day and 1940s Weekend events. The single estate model has impacted very successfully on visitor numbers. Prior to its introduction the Hall received 15k visits and now - as part of the single estate - it welcomes 145k visits with the estate as a whole becoming the second most visited paid-for attraction in Yorkshire.

Funding from Arts Council England enables significant programmes of learning for schools and families, community engagement and volunteering to take place at Lotherton Hall. These include work with the former mining community living locally and the Lotherton History group of volunteer researchers and a local youth theatre group. These projects support health and wellbeing, skills development and placemaking.

Whilst the overall cost of the estate to the Authority has fallen dramatically, LMG budgets have not increased in line with the increase in visitors and, with the majority of LMG's controllable budget wrapped up in buildings and staff, reviewing operations of the Hall, including reducing hours have to be an option.

This proposal is for the Hall to open to the public every weekend and up to 13 weeks of the year, either to align with Leeds school holidays or for other dates to support income generation. Access for schools and community groups would be maintained as currently.

This option will put 5.2 FTE posts at risk of redundancy. This will be minimised wherever possible where there are vacancies within the service or more widely in LCC. Other income streams will be explored to enhance the operational delivery of the site and the service will continue to review supplies and services budgets.

Impacts

Reduced public opening hours will mean fewer opportunities for visitors to access the Hall. In the most recent research, visitors spend on average 3 hours on site and 66% visit with children. 36% of visitors are from C2DE backgrounds. In 2018/19, the service as a whole contributed £27m to the local economy and supported 103 external jobs directly or indirectly. There will be a negative impact on these figures from this proposal.

Whilst there is a saving to the LMG budget by reducing opening hours of the Hall we will need to monitor the impact on the success of the single estate model and impact on Parks and Countryside income, including memberships which generate over £100k per year. The Hall is one of the drivers in attracting visitors and is part of the complete offer. When the Hall was closed for major refurbishment in 2014/15, visitors to the estate as a whole dropped off by around a third.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



The Hall is also part of the “indoor/weather proofing” providing something to do when visitors may otherwise be put off by the weather. Both Parks and Museums staff bring complimentary offers to the estate. LMG provide a high level of support including marketing and communications, learning, family and community programmes - which will reduce.

Further consultation will take place with staff, partners and stakeholders beyond LCC including but not limited to Lotherton Members, Friends of Leeds City Museums, Leeds Art Fund, Arts Council England and National Museum Directors’ Council.

Recommendations

Members are requested

- to note that this proposal would contribute a saving of £67k albeit with significant impacts to residents, staff and the economy.
- to approve that the Director of City Development can commence consultation on the proposals in this report as part of the council’s medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration screening – organisational change impacting on the workforce

As a public authority we need to ensure that all organisational change arrangements impacting on the workforce have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

Equality and diversity will always have relevancy to organisational changes which impact on a diverse workforce. If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration then you have already carried out an impact assessment.

A **screening** process is a short, sharp exercise, which completed at the earliest opportunity will help to determine:

- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and therefore
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Leeds Museums & Galleries
Lead person: Yvonne Hardman	Contact number: 0113 378 2096

1. Please provide a brief description of the organisational change arrangements that you are screening

Reduced opening hours at Lotherton Hall

LCC's financial position for 2021/22 means that proposals the service does not want to implement are having to be put forward. With little discretionary spend on the service's LCC budgets, any significant savings mean reducing public opening hours of sites and staff being put at risk for redundancy or reduced hours.

Lotherton Hall is one of Leeds Museums & Galleries' nine sites and is operated on a joint estate partnership model with LCC Parks & Countryside. This option would see the Hall open for general public visitors at weekends and during Leeds school holidays instead of every day as currently. This option would see school visits and community work maintained.

The subsequent change arrangements would put staff at the Hall at risk if this option proceeds.

2. Consideration of equality, diversity, cohesion and integration checklist

Questions	Yes	No
Have you already considered equality and diversity within your current and future planning?	x	
Where you have made consideration does this relate to the range of equality characteristics	x	
Have you considered positive and negative impacts for different equality characteristics	x	
Have you considered any potential barriers for different groups	x	
Have you used equality information and consultation where appropriate to develop your proposals	x	
Is there a clear plan of how equality areas identified for improvement will be addressed	No areas identified	

If you've answered **no** to the questions above, there may be gaps in your equality and diversity considerations and you should complete an equality and diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment (organisational change). Please go to **section 4**.

If you've answered **yes** to the questions above and believe you've already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 3**.

<p>3. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</p> <p>If you can demonstrate that you've considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.</p> <p>Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).</p> <p>How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration? (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected.</p> <p>This option will put 5.2 FTE posts at risk of redundancy. This will be minimised wherever possible where there are vacancies within the service or more widely in LCC.</p> <p>If this proposal goes forward, LCC staff consultation processes, including with the Trade Unions, will take place.</p> <p>As a public-facing site, there are wider considerations in relation to equality in relation to visitors, potential visitors and local communities, some of whom are strongly engaged with the site, for example through volunteer programmes.</p> <p>Key findings (think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal</p>
--

could benefit one group at the expense of another).

Reduced public opening hours will mean fewer opportunities for visitors to access the Hall. In the most recent research, visitors spend on average 3 hours on site and 66% visit with children. 36% of visitors are from C2DE backgrounds. Public consultation will be carried out if the option goes forward.

In terms of the staff who will be impacted, more work would be needed to confirm nothing has been missed in the equality and diversity considerations.

Actions

(think about how you'll promote positive impact and remove or reduce negative impact)

The impact on staff will be minimised wherever possible through vacancies within the service or more widely in LCC. Other income streams will be explored to enhance the operational delivery of the site and the service will continue to review supplies and services budgets.

Undertake a more detailed review / assessment of the equality impact of reducing opening hours.

4. If you're **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration **you'll need to carry out an impact assessment****

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

5. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Cluny Macpherson	Chief Officer, Culture and Sport	5/10/2020
Date screening completed		

6. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **executive board, full council, key delegated decisions** or a **significant operational decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- governance services will publish those relating to executive board and full council
- the appropriate directorate will publish those relating to delegated decisions and significant operational decisions
- a copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent

For executive board or full council – sent to governance services	Date sent:
For delegated decisions or significant operational decisions – sent to appropriate directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to the equality team	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Cluny Macpherson, Chief Officer, Culture and Sport

Report of: Martin Farrington, Director of City Development

Portfolios: Inclusive Growth and Culture

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Reduced opening hours at Thwaite Mills Museum
2021/22 savings from proposal	£70,000

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

Thwaite Watermill is part of Leeds Museums and Galleries (LMG), the largest local authority-run museum service in the country with one of the largest multidisciplinary collections in the UK totalling 1.3m objects - reflecting the city's industrial heritage and tradition of creativity, innovation and excellence. The collections are at the heart of the service's work to inspire school children, entertain families, support health and wellbeing, and celebrate shared heritage and local identities. In 2021 the service will celebrate 200 years since the collections were founded and the civic role of museums in the city began.

Thwaite Watermill is Grade II listed and is one of the last remaining examples of a water-powered mill in Britain. The current Mill was built between 1823-5 by the Aire and Calder Navigation Company. The site comprised the mill building, the manager's house, stables, workshop, and warehouse. The Mill was used for a range of purposes throughout its life from crushing seeds for lubrication and lighting oil or imported woods for the dyeing industry to crushing materials for the pottery, paint and pharmaceuticals and finally in the production of putty.

The Mill closed in terms of its commercial operations in 1976, after the collapse of the weir during flooding. A group of volunteers formed The Thwaite Mills Society to restore and preserve the site. Restoration of the Mill building took place in 1985 and the site was opened as a working museum in 1990. Leeds City Council then took over the lease.

It is positioned on an island between the River Aire and the Aire and Calder Navigation in Stourton two miles from the city centre. It is a unique green space providing a recreational and educational



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



facility in south Leeds. With many of the water wheels still able to turn, the Mill is now run as an eco-friendly museum and attraction, hosting workshops, weddings and events throughout the year. Alongside the buildings the site has been turned in to a natural haven, encouraging local flora and fauna to thrive.

The site is leased from the Canal and River Trust until December 2030 (it is the only LMG site not owned by the Council). LCC has requested a valuation of the site in order to look at future plans beyond 2030. LMG has developed outline plans for development in order to maximise use of the green space and draw more visitors and income. It is one of only two sites within the service where LMG operates the green space and therefore sees this site as the one with the most potential to grow income generation. This would be predicated on the site being purchased by the Council in order to lever external funding to support development schemes. This would be an 'invest to save' proposal which is currently on hold.

The Mill provides a key points of engagement with our collections for audiences and contribute their own narratives to the city's histories. It is an accredited museum, holds Visit England VAQAS status, and has received the Sandford Award quality mark for educational provision.

The option costed below is for reduced public opening. This option would see the site open to the public only at weekends. Currently it is open for weekends and Leeds school holidays.

This option will put 5.1 FTE posts at risk of redundancy. This will be minimised wherever possible where there are vacancies within the service or more widely in LCC. The working arrangements of the 0.7 FTE post funded by Arts Council England could be impacted as weekend-only opening hours would mean work with schools at Thwaite would cease, but the post also has a cross-service remit. Other income streams will be explored to enhance the operational delivery of the site and the service will continue to review supplies and services budgets.

Impacts

In 2019/20 Thwaite Watermill welcomed 21,156 visitors. During school term time, visits are pre-booked tours and workshops only. 68% of visitors are first timers and visitors are split fairly evenly across age groups. The site hosts weekend events, school workshops and community sessions. The schools' programme at Thwaite has a focus on science learning including gravity, renewable energy, Yorkshire inventors and nature.

With this option weekend only opening would reduce opportunities for visitors to access Thwaite Watermill. The schools' programme would cease along with community sessions, including work with the Youth Justice team.

The site has a wedding licence and weddings are booked for 2021. This option enables booked weddings to go ahead, with some additional staff hours costed in to facilitate this. Users of the canal moorings would also be able to stay in situ, maintaining these income streams.

In 2018/19, the service as a whole contributed £27m to the local economy and supported 103 external jobs directly or indirectly. There will be a negative impact on these figures from this proposal.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



As the site is owned by the Canal & River Trust stakeholder engagement will be required. The lease requires upkeep of the buildings and the site (the Council recently invested £616k in improvements).

Further consultation will take place with staff, partners and stakeholders beyond LCC including but not limited to Arts Council England, Friends of Leeds City Museums, National Lottery Heritage Fund, National Museum Directors' Council, community groups, schools and organisations that connect with programmes at Thwaite. The site rents canal moorings to canal boaters who would need to be consulted. Other partners including Canal Connections, Groundwork, Leeds College of Building, Pyramid – a Leeds-based arts charity supporting artists with learning disabilities, Leeds Youth Justice Service and Leeds Pagan Circle (there is a stone circle on the site).

Recommendations

Members are requested

- to note that this proposal would contribute a saving of £70,000 albeit with significant impacts to residents, staff and the economy.
- to approve that the Director of City Development can commence consultation on the proposals in this report as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration screening – organisational change impacting on the workforce

As a public authority we need to ensure that all organisational change arrangements impacting on the workforce have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

Equality and diversity will always have relevancy to organisational changes which impact on a diverse workforce. If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration then you have already carried out an impact assessment.

A **screening** process is a short, sharp exercise, which completed at the earliest opportunity will help to determine:

- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and therefore
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Leeds Museums & Galleries
Lead person: Yvonne Hardman	Contact number: 0113 378 2096

1. Please provide a brief description of the organisational change arrangements that you are screening

Reduced opening hours at Thwaite Watermill

LCC's financial position for 2021/22 means that proposals the service does not want to implement are having to be put forward. With little discretionary spend on the service's LCC budgets, any significant savings mean reducing opening hours of sites and staff redundancies or reduced hours.

Thwaite Watermill is one of Leeds Museums & Galleries' nine sites. It is Grade II listed and is one of the last remaining examples of a water-powered mill in Britain.

The subsequent change arrangements would put staff at risk if this option proceeds.

2. Consideration of equality, diversity, cohesion and integration checklist

Questions	Yes	No
-----------	-----	----

Have you already considered equality and diversity within your current and future planning?	x	
Where you have made consideration does this relate to the range of equality characteristics	x	
Have you considered positive and negative impacts for different equality characteristics	x	
Have you considered any potential barriers for different groups	x	
Have you used equality information and consultation where appropriate to develop your proposals	x	
Is there a clear plan of how equality areas identified for improvement will be addressed	No areas identified	

If you've answered **no** to the questions above, there may be gaps in your equality and diversity considerations and you should complete an equality and diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment (organisational change). Please go to **section 4**.

If you've answered **yes** to the questions above and believe you've already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 3**.

<p>3. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</p>
<p>If you can demonstrate that you've considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.</p> <p>Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).</p>
<p>How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration? (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected.</p> <p>This option will put 5.1 FTE posts at risk of redundancy. The working arrangements of the 0.7 FTE post funded by Arts Council England could be impacted as opening hours are weekends only, as work with schools at Thwaite would cease, although the post also has a cross-service remit.</p> <p>If this proposal goes forward, LCC staff consultation processes, including with the Trade Unions, will take place.</p> <p>HR advice is that while staff in those roles across the service operate to the same job descriptions, a distinction can be made that those working at Thwaite Watermill are specific to that site and therefore this would not mean everyone across the service in one of those roles being put at risk.</p> <p>As a public-facing site, there are wider considerations in relation to equality in relation to visitors, potential visitors and local communities.</p>

Key findings

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another).

Reduced public opening hours will mean fewer opportunities for visitors to access Thwaite Watermill. Public consultation will be carried out if the option goes forward.

In terms of the staff who will be impacted, more work would be needed to confirm nothing has been missed in the equality and diversity considerations.

Actions

(think about how you'll promote positive impact and remove or reduce negative impact)

The impact on staff will be minimised wherever possible through vacancies within the service or more widely in LCC. Other income streams will be explored to enhance the operational delivery of the site and the service will continue to review supplies and services budgets.

Undertake a more detailed review / assessment of the equality impact of reducing opening hours.

4. If you're **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration **you'll need to carry out an impact assessment****

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

5. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Cluny Macpherson	Chief Officer, Culture and Sport	5/10/2020
Date screening completed		

6. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **executive board, full council, key delegated decisions** or a **significant operational decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- governance services will publish those relating to executive board and full council
- the appropriate directorate will publish those relating to delegated decisions and significant operational decisions
- a copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent

For executive board or full council – sent to governance services	Date sent:
For delegated decisions or significant operational decisions – sent to appropriate directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to the equality team	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Cluny Macpherson, Chief Officer, Culture and Sport

Report of: Martin Farrington, Director of City Development

Portfolio: Inclusive Growth and Culture

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Introduction of a £3 annual charge for a Breeze Card
2021/22 savings from proposal	£ 150,000

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	No
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

Breeze is Leeds City Council's brand for young people. Its aim is to collate and communicate a rich menu of cultural, sporting and youth activities that are accessible, safe and inspiring. It is managed through the Breeze website and social media platforms. Breezecard is a young person's membership card which is currently free to anyone under 19 and incorporates a leisure discount card, offering discounted access to council provision as well as commercial retail and leisure opportunities.

The free summer programme has had a huge impact on the communities across Leeds with the programme attracting upwards of 12,000 children each summer to Breeze On Tour and Mini Breeze Events, Galas and targeted diversionary projects. Over the last 3 years Breeze has provided free summer activities for over 50,000 young people.

The team also have responsibility for the Breeze Culture Network, the online tool for professionals working with young people in the city to network and communicate more effectively. It has 1,500 members including 269 Leeds schools.

Building on the service's experience of delivering quality family events in the City, and working with the Parks & Countryside and Museums and Galleries services, the Breeze team developed the very successful Lotherton Christmas Experience in 2016, which increased the number of visitors from 9k to 65k and the total sales income from £24k to £283k.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



The Breezecard is used by c170k young people in the city and is currently free. Each card expires on the young person's 19th Birthday. This proposal introduces an annual charge of £3 as an annually recurring subscription.

Breezecard enables us to monitor access to provision, providing data that helps identify gaps in participation across the city working with area committees.

A £3 fee could theoretically accrue an additional £510k when or if all current cards are renewed. However, taking account of implementation costs, the fact that price will remain a barrier to some, and that we will want to provide the card free to some groups (for instance looked after children) the net saving of £150k is a mid-range estimate.

There is also an appetite to increase the charges for the private bookings and introduce new events at Easter and Halloween and establish drama and theatre performance camps but as yet these ideas have not been tested and may require initial investment. Any surplus from the Breezecard charging would be reinvested in such projects.

Potential impacts

Clearly the impact of charging will mean some young people will not be able to purchase the card even though the cost is generally not very prohibitive. However at the moment the card is not seen to have value, as evidenced by the number that are lost and need to be replaced.

There may be some technical and legal challenges in charging, although the option to charge has already been factored in to a much larger contract to be tendered to develop a new customer management system as part of Active Leeds – which is itself aligned to the council's core systems review. Further investigation is required, including to test synergy with the overall approach compared to the aspiration to actually reduce some elements of discounting within Leisure Centres.

Consultation with young people will be required

Recommendations

Members are requested

- to note that this proposal would contribute income of £150k through a £3 annual charge for Breeze cards.
- to approve that the Director of City Development can commence consultation on the proposals in this report as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration. In all appropriate instances we will need to carry out an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment.

This form:

- can be used to prompt discussion when carrying out your impact assessment
- should be completed either during the assessment process or following completion of the assessment
- should include a brief explanation where a section is not applicable

Directorate:	Service area: Breeze Team
Lead person: Jason Tabor	Contact number: 0113 3783160
Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment:	
Monday 5th October	

1. Title: Breeze Card
Is this a:
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy /Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service / Function <input type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify

2. Members of the assessment team:

Name	Organisation	Role on assessment team e.g. service user, manager of service, specialist
Jason Tabor	Breeze Team	Manager of Service

3. Summary of strategy, policy, service or function that was assessed:

The Breeze card is a free membership card to under 19s both in Leeds and the wider city region area. With a current membership database of c170k. This proposal is to introduce an annual subscription fee with a suggested price of £3.

Breeze card offers discounts at Active Leeds leisure centres, some cultural events and attractions within Leeds City Council as well as a small selection of private organisations. Breeze card also enables us to monitor access to provision, providing data that helps identify gaps in participation across the city working with area committees.

The card currently does not hold much value to the users apart from during the school holidays, this is evident by the amount of replacement cards issued. By moving the card onto more of a digital platform (phone app) there would be less need to continually replace cards at cost. A physical plastic card would still be available to those who would prefer or who do not have access to smart phones.

A £3 fee could accrue an additional £500k when or if all current cards are renewed. However, taking account of the fact that price will remain a barrier to some, and that we will want to provide the card free to some groups (for instance looked after children/ families on low income through Universal Credit) the saving of £150k is a mid-range estimate.

4. Scope of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment (complete - 4a. if you are assessing a strategy, policy or plan and 4b. if you are assessing a service, function or event)

4a. Strategy, policy or plan

(please tick the appropriate box below)

The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/>
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes and the supporting guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific section within the strategy, policy or plan	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide detail:

4b. Service, function, event

please tick the appropriate box below

The whole service (including service provision and employment)	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific part of the service (including service provision or employment or a specific section of the service)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Procuring of a service (by contract or grant)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide detail:

Breeze is the Brand for young people in Leeds and includes the Breeze website, Breeze Culture Network, Breeze events and projects including the Lotherton Christmas experience and the free summer programmes across the city. The Breeze card is an integral part of the offer, providing the team with an access monitoring tool. This is also embedded as the monitoring tool for the Area Committees Youth Activity Funding for organisations to report against. However this is challenging and difficult with the current limitations on the old IT function and makes it difficult to get other external organisations to use the systems in place.

The Breeze Card is managed under the Breeze Team administered through Active Leeds and the XN management system. As part of the new procurement of a management system for Active Leeds to replace XN, the Breeze card is embedded in the new system and should benefit from an upgrade to a card and membership that will be accessible, through a smart phone. Through this enhancement to the card we anticipate a better user experience and greater input from organisations across the city to maximise the use of the technology, over time the vision is to have all the cultural providers using the Breeze Smart card to provide discounted opportunities to the young people of Leeds. Through the use of the technology we aim to improve the opportunities for young people to access services and participate in activities. The aim is to have greater value in the discounted offer than the cost of the membership.

Discussions are already underway with DIS and Active Leeds in how we develop this strategy and how we can reinvest the membership fee into the delivery of services for the young people.

5. Fact finding – what do we already know

Make a note here of all information you will be using to carry out this assessment. This could include: previous consultation, involvement, research, results from perception surveys, equality monitoring and customer/ staff feedback.

(priority should be given to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration related information)

The Breeze card provides a discount price for the Active Leeds Leisure Centres and is recognised on the pricing structure for a number of dryside and wetside activities.

Leeds Card as the adult card is a paid card currently £10 to become a Leeds Card holder to gain discounts, there is also a Leeds Card Extra for residents that qualify for the card free and the Leeds Card 60 for residents over 60.

The same approach could be taken with families on Universal Credit / FSM and those young people in the care system could receive free Breeze membership.

Consultation with the cultural sector needs to take place to engage wider and encourage greater uptake of the Breeze membership. This would be undertaken through the relevant council departments and sections as well as the Breeze Arts Development Group. Child Friendly Leeds.

With the new management system and the smart phone technology there is an opportunity to provide insight into the cultural offer across the city and through this data look at gaps in provision and inequality and identify ways in which we can challenge those inequalities.

Through consultation with the Breeze Culture Network there is a real appetite to engage in a robust data collection tool the challenge at the minute is that the technology supporting the Breeze card and the websites and information management systems that support that are out of date and difficult to use which means that we are unable to encourage greater use by the partners around the city as we are unable to provide them with the relevant systems. With a membership fee we would have greater engagement with the wider cultural providers across the city with real live accessible data.

Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information
Please provide detail:

None

Action required:

6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested

☐

Yes

☒

No

Please provide detail:

The plan would be to engage with the groups highlighted above including the Youth Council.

Action required:

If the agreement to move to a membership fee was agreed then there would be a wider engagement with organisations in the New Year to look at what the offer and enhancements could be and how we could work towards those for 2021. Building on the existing Breeze discount offers and the introduction of the new LMS. It would not be

feasible to implement the membership prior to the roll out of the new LMS and marketing awareness campaign. This could be integrated and rolled out prior to the start of Summer 2021.

7. Who may be affected by this activity?

please tick all relevant and significant equality characteristics, stakeholders and barriers that apply to your strategy, policy, service or function

Equality characteristics

☒

Age

☐

Carers

☐

Disability

☐

Gender reassignment

☐

Race

☐

**Religion
or Belief**

☐

Sex (male or female)

☐

Sexual orientation

☐

Other

(**Other** can include – marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, and those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being)

Please specify:

This is a membership for young people and relies on the parents' willingness to purchase a membership.

Stakeholders

☒

Services users

☐

Employees

☐

Trade Unions

☐

Partners

☐

Members

☐

Suppliers

☐

Other please specify

Potential barriers.

☐

Built environment

☐

Location of premises and services

☒

--

☐

Information and communication	Customer care
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stereotypes and assumptions
<input type="checkbox"/> Cost	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation and involvement
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial exclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment and training
<input type="checkbox"/> specific barriers to the strategy, policy, services or function	

Please specify

Information and Communication – Making sure that we have the correct offer and improvements to the offer for young people and been able to communicate that will be key to engaging parents and older young people with the Breeze offer.

Timing – If the offer is not strong enough and parents and young people can see the benefit in being a member then they will not join and the membership will shrink. When to make the new membership live and the impact that could have.

Stereotypes and Assumptions – The Breeze card has always been free and some will be some that will want that to remain regardless. The improvements and benefits need to be strong enough to challenge that assumption and position. There needs to be greater benefit to cost.

8. Positive and negative impact
Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers

8a. Positive impact:

Breezecard operates as a discount card for young people to access cultural and sporting provision, therefore it provides a gateway for lower income families to access cultural events from a wider spread of geographical areas across the city.

Breezecard is used as an effective monitoring tool by anonymising young people's data to be able to map attendance at events and activities. This in turn helps inform funding partners, such as the Youth Activity Fund from Community Committees who can ensure equality information is used to inform and plan future activities within the city. This has been used to identify how well the proposed allocations support everyone in the city.

Opportunity for the cultural partners in the city to have access to an online monitoring system for funding returns as well as insight into activity attendance.

Action required:

Working with DIS and Leeds Active to look at the opportunities for the new LMS as part of the procurement of a new system.

8b. Negative impact:
<p>We are replacing a service that is currently free with a paid membership with an annual fee.</p> <p>This could present a barrier to some families with low incomes and multiple children</p>
Action required:
<p>By working with our colleagues in Children's Services we will be able to identify and target those children in a discreet manner who are in receipt of free school meals and Looked After Children to be able to give them continued access to Breezecard at no charge. There will be no visible differentiation between a paid card and a free card reducing any possible stigma attached to those in either of those equality areas.</p>

9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups/communities identified?
<div><div><input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> No</div></div> <p>Please provide detail: Provide clearer insight to the activities taking place across the city and who is accessing these. Provide greater opportunities to target resources and services as well as share information directly with young people in communities.</p>
<p>Action required: Share the vision with partners across the culture sector in the development of the Breeze card. Work with DIS and the culture sector to scope the development and improvement of the Breeze Culture Network.</p>

10. Does this activity bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other? (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)
<div><div><input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> No</div></div>

Please provide detail:

It could as it would provide greater insight into what is available and the gaps in provision in communities.

Having the ability to analyse the data and activity history will through marketing technology bring people together who have common interests from different communities such as sport, music and dance. Being able to share information directly to young people not based on geographical information can help in breaking down those barriers.

Action required:

Continue to engage in the tendering process for the replacement of XN. Share the information on the opportunities that the Breezecard and the new system could do with the different organisations and culture partners.

11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another? (e.g. where your activity/decision is aimed at adults could it have an impact on children and young people)

☒

Yes

☐

No

Please provide detail:

It could be perceived as benefitting those that have money and can afford and have the ability to complete the membership on line.

Action required:

Make sure that those families most in need can access the card. Clear information promoted through schools, cultural organisations, sport centres, libraries and other council buildings as well as through social media platforms.

Campaign through the social workers and care sector to make sure those young people in care have the best access to not only the card but also to the services and activities.

12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
If the agreement to move to a membership fee was agreed then there would be a wider engagement with organisations in the New Year to look at what the offer and enhancements	Jan 2021 onwards Breeze Membership scheme from Summer 2021 at the earliest	Range of culture partners across the city. With offers for young people through the Breeze card	JT
Share the vision with partners across the culture sector in the development of the Breeze card. Work with DIS and the culture sector to scope the development and improvement of the Breeze Culture Network	Oct 2020 – March 2021	Steering group established for the Culture Network Cultural partners signed up to implement Breezecard monitoring	JT
Children's Services we will be able to identify those children who are in receipt of free school meals and Looked After Children to be able to give them continued access to Breezecard at no charge.	Feb – March 2021 Access to membership when live June 2021	Information shared with Parents of children on FSM of the new membership	JT

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
Continue to engage in the tendering process for the replacement of XN.	Oct – Dec 2020	New LMS procured that meets the needs of the Breeze Card	JT
Share the information on the opportunities that the Breezecard and the new system could do with the different organisations and culture partners.	Jan – Feb 2021	More organisations signing up to Culture Network and offering discounted activities / services	JT
Make sure that those families most in need can access the card.	April 2021	Clear information promoted through schools, cultural organisations, sport centres, libraries and other council buildings as well as through social media platforms.	JT
Children in the Looked after sector have a Breeze card	May – June 2021	Campaign through the social care sector to make sure those. Increase in the number of young people in the care sector using the Breeze card	JT

13. Governance, ownership and approval

State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment

Name	Job Title	Date
Jason Tabor	Out of School Activities Team Manager	05/10/2020
Date impact assessment completed		

14. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions (please tick)

- ☒ As part of Service Planning performance monitoring
- ☐ As part of Project monitoring
- ☐ Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board
Please specify which board
- ☐ Other (please specify)

15. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality impact assessment should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality impact assessments that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached assessment was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Cluny Macpherson, Chief Officer, Culture and Sport

Report of: Martin Farrington, Director of City Development

Portfolios: Inclusive Growth and Culture

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Reduced programme and new delivery model for Leeds Lights
2021/22 savings from proposal	£208,000

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	No
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Leeds is unique in core cities in manufacturing, maintaining and installing its own city centre festive lights display. Other cities (or their Business Improvement Districts or Destination Management Organisations) tend to buy in lights from commercial suppliers at a lower cost.

Currently there are over 15 miles and 1,200 individual motifs across the City.

The main Christmas display consists of 469 Lamp column motifs across the city centre, the Christmas tree in City Square and festoon curtains and rope lights to cover the Town Hall and Civic Hall. The team also manage the installation and illumination of 10 natural trees at various locations throughout the city. This work is funded from the core revenue budget.

The team also manufacture, install and de-install 610 Lamp column motifs and 69 cut trees for displays in 51 District centres, towns and villages in Leeds. The displays outside the city centre are funded separately through Area Committees or local trade organisations.

Income to the service is therefore generated through the installation of all city dressing (banners etc.) throughout the city and various small towns. Some further income is generated by supplying lights to neighbouring authorities.

Other services provided include the maintenance, delivery and recovery of the High Dependence Unit (effectively a mobile 'changing places' accessible toilet) for outdoor events, and a call out and maintenance service throughout the year due to the increase in the number of displays that remain on all year round. The service assists in the formal lighting of the Menorah, and its storage when it is not in position outside Leeds Town Hall.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



The net cost of the service is £308k.

It is proposed that £100k is retained to tender for a much reduced commercial Festive Light Service just for the city centre – a similar model to that delivered by other core cities. This would realise an annual saving therefore of £208k

Impacts

This option would see the Leeds Light workshop close with 9 FTE staff therefore being at risk of redundancy (one staff member has requested to leave as part of the Early Leavers Initiative). Some have specialist skills. Staff would clearly be affected by potential job losses from these options, although alternative roles would be sought for them elsewhere in the Council. It is a complex, stressful and time-consuming time for all affected.

In addition to the impact on staff, this is a significant and much appreciated service by communities and their elected members. District centres, and outlying towns and villages and others would need to seek other commercial providers.

Events would need to bear the full costs of accessing the HDU unit, and storage options reviewed. The disposal or sale of existing light motifs would need to be determined.

£65,000 of Current costs are internal recharges, so services elsewhere in the authority may lose this income, potentially reducing the corporate impact of this saving. There may however be additional advantages to the overall estate costs, through ending occupation of the Leeds Lights Workshop in Seacroft. This is yet to be determined.

In addition to staff and the public, consultation is required with organisations that currently purchase services from Leeds Lights. Early engagement is required with the retail sector in the city centre in particular, and with the Business Improvement District – including to investigate any additional funding or other opportunities.

Recommendations

- to note that this proposal would contribute a saving of £208k albeit with significant impacts to residents, staff and the economy.
- to approve that the Director of City Development can commence consultation on the proposals in this report as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration. In all appropriate instances we will need to carry out an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment.

This form:

- can be used to prompt discussion when carrying out your impact assessment
- should be completed either during the assessment process or following completion of the assessment
- should include a brief explanation where a section is not applicable

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Arts, Events & Venues
Lead person: Matthew Sims	Contact number: 378 7172
Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment:	

1. Title: Closure of the Leeds Lights Service
Is this a:
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy /Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service / Function <input type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify

2. Members of the assessment team:

Name	Organisation	Role on assessment team e.g. service user, manager of service, specialist
Cluny Macpherson	LCC	Chief Officer
Matthew Sims	LCC	HOS

3. Summary of strategy, policy, service or function that was assessed:
<p>The Leeds Lights service is an in-house provision responsible for manufacturing, maintaining and installation / recovery of the city centre festive light display which consists of approx. 470 individual lamp column motifs, the Christmas tree in City Square together with bespoke lighting effects for the Town Hall and Civic Hall.</p> <p>The team also manufacture, install / recover and store approx. 610 Lamp column motifs and lighting for 69 cut trees for displays in 51 District centres, towns and villages in Leeds. The displays outside the city centre are funded separately through area committees or local trade organisations.</p> <p>The service is also responsible for annual storing, installation / removal and hoist access for the annual lighting of the Menorah in support of the Jewish community and the year round installation and recovery of all city dressing banners as part of the current LCC contract with Bay Media.</p> <p>The team is made up of 8 FTE and 1 PTE staff and resides at the city council owned depot in Seacroft.</p>

4. Scope of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment (complete - 4a. if you are assessing a strategy, policy or plan and 4b. if you are assessing a service, function or event)
--

4a. Strategy, policy or plan (please tick the appropriate box below)	
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/>
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes and the supporting guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific section within the strategy, policy or plan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please provide detail:	

4b. Service, function, event please tick the appropriate box below	
The whole service (including service provision and employment)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A specific part of the service (including service provision or employment or a specific section of the service)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Procuring of a service	<input type="checkbox"/>

(by contract or grant)	
Please provide detail: The proposal is to close the service in its entirety with the council to retain a reduced budget to outsource a smaller city centre lighting provision from the commercial sector.	

5. Fact finding – what do we already know Make a note here of all information you will be using to carry out this assessment. This could include: previous consultation, involvement, research, results from perception surveys, equality monitoring and customer/ staff feedback. (priority should be given to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration related information)
The outline proposal to close the service will be discussed by the council's Executive Board and if approved will now be put forward for staff and Trade Union consultation.
Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information Please provide detail:
Action required: Consultation with staff and Trade Unions

6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No </div> </div>
Please provide detail: At present all core staff, ward Cllrs, outer area committees and external stakeholders who will be directly affected by the closure are unaware of the proposals.
Action required: To inform all staff, ward Cllrs, outer area committees and external stakeholders of the proposals following Trade Union consultation

7. Who may be affected by this activity? please tick all relevant and significant equality characteristics, stakeholders and barriers that apply to your strategy, policy, service or function
Equality characteristics

<input type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Carers	<input type="checkbox"/> Disability
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/> Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief
<input type="checkbox"/> Sex (male or female)	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		

(Other can include – marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, and those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being)

Please specify: No equality group will be affected differently to others

Stakeholders

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services users	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Members	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suppliers
<input type="checkbox"/> Other please specify		

Potential barriers.

<input type="checkbox"/> Built environment	<input type="checkbox"/> Location of premises and services
<input type="checkbox"/> Information and communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer care
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timing	<input type="checkbox"/> Stereotypes and assumptions
<input type="checkbox"/> Cost	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation and involvement
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial exclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment and training
<input type="checkbox"/> specific barriers to the strategy, policy, services or function	

Please specify

The staff are currently out working nights on the installation this year's city centre and

outer area displays and so full staff engagement will be difficult

8. Positive and negative impact Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers
8a. Positive impact:
None
Action required:
N/A

8b. Negative impact:
Loss of 8 FTE and 1 PTE equivalent posts Withdrawal of operational support for outer area funded displays Withdrawal of operational support for the Jewish community and annual Chanukah festival
Action required:
To conduct an internal skills audit to help identify any potential redeployment opportunities To support area committees in sourcing alternative external service provider To support the Jewish community in sourcing alternative external service provider

9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups/communities identified?
<div><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</div>
Please provide detail:
Action required: N/A

--

10. Does this activity bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other? (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)

☐

Yes

☒

No

Please provide detail:

Action required:

N/A

11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another? (e.g. where your activity/decision is aimed at adults could it have an impact on children and young people)

☐

Yes

☒

No

Please provide detail:

Action required:

N/A

12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
Consultation with Trade Unions	End of October	Formal proposals submitted / consultation meeting undertaken	
To inform all staff, ward Cllrs, outer area committees and external stakeholders of the proposals following Trade Union consultation	End of November	Staff informed in writing and via face to face meeting Cllrs, area committees and all external partners informed in writing	
To conduct an internal skills audit to help identify any potential redeployment opportunities	End of December	JD information submitted to jobs & skills / redeployment team	
To support area committees in identifying / sourcing alternative external service provider	End of March 2021	Information provided / discussion	

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
To support the Jewish community in identifying / sourcing alternative external service provider	End of March 2021	Information provided / discussion	

13. Governance, ownership and approval

State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment

Name	Job Title	Date
Date impact assessment completed		05 / 10 / 20

14. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions (please tick)

- ☒ As part of Service Planning performance monitoring
- ☐ As part of Project monitoring
- ☐ Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board
Please specify which board
- ☐ Other (please specify)

15. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality impact assessment should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality impact assessments that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached assessment was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Cluny Macpherson, Chief Officer, Culture and Sport

Report of: Martin Farrington, Director of City Development

Portfolios: Environment and Active Lifestyles

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Withdrawal from Service Level Agreement to support Chippendale Pool
2021/22 savings from proposal	£37,000 (plus £50,000 in other service areas)

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

Active Leeds service delivers a broad range activities and programmes for everyone as well as targeted initiatives both in leisure and wellbeing centres and local community settings. The service currently operates 17 leisure and wellbeing centres, with 22 pools and 12 gyms within them, over 3.6m people visit annually. The centres deliver a comprehensive weekly programme of activities including 400 fitness classes and over 10,000 private swim lessons, as well as currently catering for over 22,500 health and fitness members.

The service supports a wide range of corporate priorities including supporting inclusive growth and addressing health inequalities through the physical and mental benefits of active lifestyles. It has developed innovative partnerships that have helped the council save money in other directorates such as Adult Social Care day care service integration within Leisure Centres.

The service also helps schools achieve their statutory duty of helping children learn to swim as well as providing private swimming lessons. It raises over £1m pa worth of commissioned and grant funded activity secured by working with our partners in areas such as falls reduction, cardiac care, crime diversion and activities for families and young people.

The service also takes the strategic lead role on behalf of the Council (working with Public Health) in the establishment of the new 'Physical Activity Ambition', directly supporting one the Council's priorities of Active Lifestyles.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



The Service operates on a very cost effective basis with the majority of our Leisure centres creating a surplus within the Active Leeds revenue budget, and overall the service is far more reliant on income than on council subsidy. In those operating conditions and the Council's financial predicament the service has considered closure/removal of service offer of some of those Leisure Centres where operating costs are highest. Chippendale Pool is one of those centres.

An agreement is in place with Otley Prince Henry's Academy Trust for Active Leeds to operate the swimming pool to provide the facility to the local community to offer provision of primary school swimming lessons, private swimming lessons and public swimming sessions. There are around 275 children on the learn-to-swim programme and c13k visits to public swimming, which is relatively low compared to other centres. The pool was originally constructed with the fundraising support of local people. It is unique in the portfolio of centres in that it is not Council owned.

Impacts

There are c5.6 full time equivalent posts at Chippendale. Active Leeds currently has in excess of 20 vacancies across the service and it is anticipated that alternative roles can be offered to any displaced staff, even without taking the current programme of voluntary measures into consideration.

If the Council withdraws from operations the closest leisure centre is Aireborough Leisure Centre. The majority of the programme should however be accommodated at Aireborough, although some times of sessions would need to change. Should the school take on the delivery of community sessions it would have the potential to reduce some of the revenue savings proposed as the classes would not transfer to Aireborough, however the wider community benefits would be improved.

Not all the budget for the pool sits within Active Leeds as Asset Management also invests £50k towards the energy costs. For the purposes of clarity of savings that saving is recorded within Asset Management proposals.

Negotiations with the school would to understand the full impact on it of removing our services, as the council also helps fund repairs to the pool and provide chemicals etc.

The withdrawal from the SLA would place the future of the existing pool in jeopardy and without mitigating measures likely to meet with significant resistance from the local community.

There will potentially be knock on effect on other Council services such as cleaning services where this is bought in. There will also be a reduced requirement for any ongoing maintenance to the site, however there will be costs associated with closing the site down to ensure it safe. There may be also be other central resources affected if sites are removed, such as HR, Payroll etc.

A comprehensive consultation and engagement plan will be required, especially around customers and staff. Consultation with the trust or any future operator is required.

Recommendations

Members are requested

- to note that this proposal would contribute a saving of £37k (plus £50k within consequent Asset Management proposals) albeit with significant impacts on staff, and a reduction in opportunities for residents to improve their physical and mental health.
- to approve that the Director of City Development can commence consultation on the proposals in this report as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Active Leeds
Lead person: Steven Baker	Contact number: 3780293

1. Title: Withdrawal from Service Level Agreement to support Chippendale Pool

Is this a:

☐

Strategy / Policy

☒

Service / Function

☐

Other

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

Screening for the possible withdrawal from Service Level Agreement to support Chippendale Pool as part of the service reviews for saving proposals for 2021/2022

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?		x
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	x	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		x
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?	x	
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment Advancing equality of opportunity Fostering good relations 		x

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?**

(think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

An agreement is in place with Otley Prince Henry's Academy Trust for Active Leeds to operate the swimming pool to provide the facility to the local community to offer provision of primary school swimming lessons, private swimming lessons and public swimming sessions. There are around 275 children on the learn to swim programme and only 13k visit to public swimming, which is low. The pool was originally constructed with the fundraising support of local people.

There are c5.6 full time equivalent staff members at Chippendale.

If the Council withdraws from operations the closest leisure centre is Aireborough Leisure Centre. The vast majority of the programme should however be accommodated at Aireborough, although some times of sessions would need to change. (Note Programmed activity might not transfer should an arrangement with a 3rd party prove successful)

Data on users at Chippendale is very limited as for the last 2 years people have been moved from Aireborough Leisure Centre whilst the pool has been closed to Chippendale so the data for actually Chippendale usage has been affected. However the vast majority of people using the pool is through junior swimming lessons and school swimming. There are just over 300 adults swimming registered on the database which is very small compared to any other pools. There are no disabilities or BAME users groups identified on the system.

When we look at the postcodes that are using the centre we can see that the local postcodes around the centre are using the facilities only.

The average travel distance to Chippendale is the lowest of all leisure centres. Aireborough is 4 miles away and which is the average travel distance people will travel to other leisure centres in Leeds.

A full consultation plan will be devised with all affected stakeholders if the proposal is approved to move forward with the closure.

- **Key findings**

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

As we can see from the data of usage, there are no key groups that will be affected by the closure especially in terms of swimming pool usage, and all will be able to be accommodated in Aireborough if the talks are not successful with another provider taking over the agreement.

There is already a strong connection with Aireborough Leisure Centre and from the

customer data people that use Chippendale also use Aireborough for activities. It would be possible to keep the vast majority of people on swimming lessons and public swimming by accommodating them at Aireborough Leisure Centre.

Local people will be affected by the closure and its whether they are prepared to travel to Aireborough or not.

- **Actions**

(think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

Undertake a more detailed review / assessment of the equality impact of withdrawing the agreement for Chippendale swimming pool.

Continue talks with 3rd party provider in taking over the agreement.

Work with the key partners to build a communication and engagement plan around the withdrawal; ensure consistent messaging.

Look to sign-post residents / communities, where appropriate, to other partners and facilities.

5. If you are **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment.****

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Mark Allman	Head of Active Leeds	24.08.2020
Date screening completed		

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision

making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21stth October 2020

Report author(s): Cluny Macpherson, Chief Officer, Culture and Sport

Report of: Martin Farrington, Director of City Development

Portfolios: Environment and Active Lifestyles

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Closure of Yeadon Tarn Sailing Centre
2021/22 savings from proposal	£88,000

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

The context and rationale for the closure of Yeadon Tarn Sailing Centre is similar to that described in the proposal for Chippendale Pool (elsewhere on this agenda). Yeadon Tarn is another centre which requires significant subsidy.

The Council has provided learn to sail opportunities from Yeadon Tarn for over 30 years. The existing facility benefitted from New Opportunities Fund investment which saw the onsite facilities significantly improved, this included changing, office and teaching facilities. The site is predominantly used by schools, together with some public sessions.

Various attempts have been made to reduce operating costs in recent years and this has included conversations with Youth Services and Civic Enterprise Leeds and soft market testing of a community transfer. In terms of CEL there have been proposals to create a cafe within the existing building, however this is unlikely to generate significant savings to the scale required.

Should Yeadon Tarn Sailing centre close then the building could be converted to a café and/or transferred to a local organisation to operate (but not as a sailing centre - TUPE implications).

Potential impacts

There are c3.75 full time equivalent staff members at the Sailing and Activity Centre, 1 of the full time posts is currently vacant. Active Leeds currently has in excess of 20 vacancies across the service and it is anticipated that alternative roles can be offered to displaced staff, even without taking the current programme of voluntary measures into consideration.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



The closure of the sailing centre is likely to meet with significant resistance from the local community and schools in particular. A lottery grant (New Opportunities Fund 3) helped make improvements on site and we would need to consider the implications of grant payback should the Council withdraw. (4 years of a 20 year agreement remain from an original grant of £850k).

There may be a knock on effect for other service areas such as cleaning services where this is bought in. There will also be a reduced for any ongoing maintenance to the site and costs associated with closing the site down to ensure it safe. There will also be other central resources affected if sites are removed, such as HR.

A comprehensive consultation and engagement plan will need to be devised, especially around customers and staff. Consultation with New Opportunities Fund or its successor is required.

Recommendations

Members are requested

- to note that this proposal would contribute a saving of £88k albeit with significant impacts on staff, and a reduction in opportunities for residents to improve their physical and mental health.
- to approve that the Director of City Development can commence consultation on the proposals in this report.

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Active Leeds
Lead person: Steven Baker	Contact number: 3780293

1. Title: Closure of Leeds Sailing and Activity Centre

Is this a:

☐

Strategy / Policy

☒

Service / Function

☐

Other

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

Screening for the possible closure of Leeds Sailing and Activity Centre, as part of the service reviews for saving proposals for 2021/2022

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	x	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	x	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?	x	
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?	x	
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment• Advancing equality of opportunity• Fostering good relations		x

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

• **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

The site is mainly offers coached activity to groups of people such as school and youth groups, but there are individual bookings made as well on coaching courses such as sailing, kayak and windsurfing.

The sailing centre records the lowest number of visits to the facility when compared to all the other leisure centres in Leeds with 19/20 recording just over 8,000 visits. The next lowest is Middleton Leisure Centre at over 65,000 visits per annum.

There are the equivalent of 3.75 full time employees, with 3 staff being male and the facility manager being female.

More detailed analysis of the data can be done to identify key groups and characteristics affected by the proposal. Looking at the detail in terms of the make up of the visits by whom, where they come from, how many are accessing the services through the Leeds Card Extra, how many are disabled, the gender splits, and BME's ect. However, due to the nature of the activities there are substantially more younger people that access the courses than older people. With the vast majority being of teenage age with an average age of attendance being 13 years of age. A higher proportion of the visits are made by males (69%) which would coincide with the type of activities on offer attracting more male participation than females. Due to the nature of the activities again being out on the water the disability visits are lower than any of the leisure centres. Again due to the nature of the activities the facility doesn't attract people with the Leeds Card Extra which is available to disadvantage people in Leeds. As the cost to participate in these type of activities are higher than other activities, especially if people want to take it seriously with owning their own equipment such as a boat etc. However we do know that the school usage which have people in these categories. We also do work closely with schools which have troubled youngsters as these type of activities are used to help instil skills such as confidence, communication, and discipline.

People travel to the venue across Leeds and outside Leeds, it isn't just an activity that attracts local people as they are specialised activities on offer. People travel a lot further than we see at our leisure centres. There are other venues that provide similar activities and coaching with Otley Sailing Club and Yeadon Tarn Sailing Club offering similar activities. There are also other venues that offer the same as the sailing centre in Bradford, Wakefield, Huddersfield and York.

This is the only venue within the Active Leeds portfolio to offer these type of outdoor water based programmes. However

A full consultation plan will be devised with all affected stakeholders if the proposal is approved to move forward with the closure.

- **Key findings**

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

As we can see from the data of usage, the key equalities groups won't be greatly affected as people are not attracted to these activities. The usage of the lake by people will still be able to happen for them to carry out activities on the lake.

There are opportunities to work with other service areas to ensure some activities are still able to take place and could complement Herd Farm activities for example.

There are also opportunities to work with the club who manage the lake at times Active Leeds doesn't to see whether they can offer more activities and coaching opportunities as well.

There are also opportunities to ensure people are aware of other club activities in and around Leeds if this is the type of activity that is on offer.

The biggest impact will be on the group users whether that is schools or other educational providers, however with other facilities offering these activities it should lessen the impact of this.

- **Actions**

(think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

Undertake a more detailed review / assessment of the equality impact of withdrawing the service from Leeds Sailing and Activity Centre.

Work with the key partners to build a communication and engagement plan around the withdrawal; ensure consistent messaging.

Look to sign-post residents / communities, where appropriate, to other partners and offers.

5. If you are **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and**

integration you will need to carry out an impact assessment.	
Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

6. Governance, ownership and approval		
Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening		
Name	Job title	Date
Mark Allman	Head of Active Leeds	19.08.2020
Date screening completed		

7. Publishing	
<p>Though all key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council only publishes those related to Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions or a Significant Operational Decision.</p> <p>A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council. • The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions. • A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record. <p>Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:</p>	
For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21stth October 2020

Report author(s): Cluny Macpherson, Chief Officer, Culture and Sport

Report of: Martin Farrington, Director of City Development

Portfolios: Environment and Active Lifestyles

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Operating efficiencies at John Charles Centre for Sport (JCCS)
2021/22 savings from proposal	£200,000

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

JCCS is a unique site. It carries the highest net operating costs of all Active Leeds sites at £1.4m pa. In practice the site is actually an amalgamation of a number of separate specialist sports facilities, with inefficiencies built in, such as separate reception points for each building. (Aquatics centre/Main stadium with stand/Tennis centre/Indoor Bowls and Athletics centre/Outdoor all weather pitches). The site recognises the city's regional and sub-regional role in the provision of these specialist facilities, however, their provision comes at a cost. The site generates a throughput of 403k visits pa, with overall attendances on a downward trajectory in recent years (434k in 2017/18).

The majority of the net costs are associated with the Aquatics Centre (50m pool and Diving) and the Stadium itself (stand/athletics track/infield).

The tennis centre operates at a relatively small subsidy with the recent partnership with the Yorkshire Lawn Tennis Association proving to be very beneficial in improving the tennis offer and reducing operating costs.

Proposals for efficiencies will therefore focus on the following within the overall site

1. Increasing the income from targeted fee increases as well as increasing income from more commercial event activity (subject to the events industry having recovered from COVID). It is not anticipated that this will have a major impact on community use. Estimated saving = £50,000.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



2. Improving the cost recovery of the Diving training scheme by increasing fees and decreasing staffing costs. Current subsidy is £50k. Estimated saving = £50k.
3. Review of on-site staffing structures, with the aim of removing a small number of posts. = £50k.
4. Explore establishing a partnership with a 3rd party (e.g. the LTA) to operate the existing tennis centres on a lease or licence arrangement. Saving = £50k

Impacts

The aim of these proposals is to minimise impact on the public but considerable negotiation will be required with the partners mentioned above.

Whilst there may be some impact on staff, Active Leeds currently has in excess of 20 vacancies across the service and it is anticipated that alternative roles can be offered to any displaced staff, even without taking the programme of voluntary measures into consideration

Proposals would be subject to consultation with key stakeholders (those that hire) as well as staff where any restructure/changes to working practices are required.

Recommendations

Members are requested:

- to note that this proposal would contribute a saving of £200k should negotiations with partners conclude positively.
- to approve that the Director of City Development can commence consultation on the proposals in this report as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Active Leeds
Lead person: Steven Baker	Contact number: 3780293

1. Title: Operating efficiencies within John Charles Centre for Sport

Is this a:

☒ **Strategy / Policy** ☐ **Service / Function** ☐ **Other**

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

Screening for the possibly savings below as part of the service reviews for saving proposals for 2021/2022 :

- 1. Increasing the income from targeted fee increases as well as increasing income from more commercial event activity (subject to the events industry having recovered from COVID).**
- 2. Improving the cost recovery of the Diving training scheme by increasing fees and decreasing staffing costs.**
- 3. Explore lease or licence arrangement with the Yorkshire Lawn Tennis Association to take control of the tennis centre.**

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?		x
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	x	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		x
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?	x	
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment • Advancing equality of opportunity • Fostering good relations 		x

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?**

(think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

JCCS is a unique site, in practice the sites is actually an amalgamation of a number of separate specialist sports facilities, with inefficiencies built including separate reception points for each building. (Aquatics centre/Main stadium with stand/Tennis centre/Indoor Bowls and Athletics centre/Outdoor all weather pitches). The site recognises the city's regional and sub-regional role in the provision of these specialist facilities, however, their provision comes at a cost. The site generates a throughput of 403k visits per annum.

Nothing is being removed as part of the efficiencies other than the staffing make up to operate these facilities. There shouldn't be any effect on the public other than the swim diving scheme where costs may increase and people still be able to afford the new prices. However there are mechanisms in place to ensure people who can't afford the prices are able to receive support to meet these.

Club increased fees are not increasing rates above the rates of other swimming pools and or facilities, they will still below other local authorities. Prices will be negotiated to ensure the clubs can afford the costs.

The tennis centre lease arrangements with Yorkshire Lawn Tennis Association (YLTA) will be to protect the tennis centre for any reductions. Since the YLTA starting operating out of the tennis centre in 2019 the usage of the site has increased. The lease will be there so they operate the tennis centre as they have the skills set to improve the tennis centre further. They will be able to obtain further funds to improve the building and the activities on offer. There will be protected times for the pay as you go tennis and coaching schemes to ensure these are maintained and enhanced further.

Staffing reviews will be investigated and where possible, positions will be removed, however again working across all the leisure centres, there will be opportunities to move into other position and possible links with partners such as the YLTA which may want to use their services. There are also already vacancies in the staffing structure so jobs could be maintained at JCCS.

A full consultation plan will be devised with all affected stakeholders if the proposal is approved to move forward.

- **Key findings**

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

As we can see from the data of usage, there will be very limited impact on the public and no equality characteristics affected.

We will work with partners to strengthen the activities on offer especially in terms of the tennis centre. However the training schemes will be able to offer more support once the costs are recovered to provide a better overall experience.

No affect on the public access of the services.

- **Actions**

(**think about** how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

Undertake a more detailed review / assessment of the equality impact of withdrawing each proposal.

Continue talks with 3rd party provider in taking over the agreement.

Work with the key partners to build a communication and engagement plan; ensure consistent messaging.

5. If you are *not* already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you *will need to carry out an impact assessment*.

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Mark Allman	Head of Active Leeds	24.08.2020
Date screening completed		

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full

Council.

- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author: John Woolmer, Acting Chief Officer (Environmental Services)

Report of: Director of Communities & Environment

Portfolio: Environment & Active Lifestyles

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Closure of Otley Ellar Ghyll household waste and recycling centre/site
2021/22 savings from proposal	£110k

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

Due to council wide budget pressures, a review of the number of HWRCs run by LCC has been undertaken. Otley (Ellar Ghyll) HWRC has the lowest tonnages of waste/recycled material per annum of the 8 Leeds sites and has the least use by Leeds residents. In order to contribute towards required budgetary savings across the Council it is proposed to close this site.

Recommendations

Members are requested to consider the proposal to close the Household Waste and Recycling Centre at Otley (Ellar Ghyll).

This will achieve a saving of £110k per year from the operational budget covering the Household Waste and Recycling Centres across Leeds, with the least disruption to staff and customers.

Member are also to approve the proposal going out to consultation as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.

James Rogers, Director of Communities and Environment, will be responsible.

Impacts of proposal General:

- Ellar Ghyll has the lowest usage of all the HWSSs, receiving less than 4,000 tonnes per annum compared to an average of over 8,000 tonnes for the other 6 sites;
- When considering the site running costs, Ellar Ghyll cost £63 per tonne, compared to an average of £40 per tonne across the other sites;



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



- Ellar Ghyll has relatively high usage by Bradford Council residents given the location, and so the value for money of this site is even poorer based just on the Leeds resident usage; Bradford do contribute financially towards the cost of processing the waste collected though.
- All staff affected by the proposal could be redeployed to other sites where there are existing vacancies.

Proposal to close Ellar Ghyll:

- Ellar Ghyll is a physically constrained site with little scope to expand the recycling offer;
- Milner's Road (Yeadon) is 3 miles/10 minutes' drive away from Ellar Ghyll, and easily accessible along the major highway network;
- Milner's Road is a better and much bigger site (16 bays compared to 6 at Ellar Ghyll), and is currently under-utilised in terms of capacity;
- Closure would deliver approx £110k per annum savings (plus potential capital receipt).

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: Communities & Environment	Service area: Environmental Services
Lead person: Liz Behrens	Contact number:

1. Title:

Closure of Otley (Ellar Ghyll) HWRC to the public

Is this a:

☐

Strategy / Policy

☒

Service / Function

☐

Other

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

The decision to close to the public the Otley (Ellar Ghyll) Household Waste and Recycling Centre. The impact on and considerations required for the public/customers.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?		X
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	Y	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?	Y	
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?	Y	
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment• Advancing equality of opportunity• Fostering good relations		N

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?**
(**think about** the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

- **Key findings**
(**think about** any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

- **Actions**
(**think about** how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

5. If you are *not* already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you *will need to carry out an impact assessment*.

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	November 2020 (subject to Exec Board approval in Oct 20)
Date to complete your impact assessment	December 2020
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	Liz Behrens, Service Manager

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
John Woolmer	Chief Officer (Acting)	9/10.20
Date screening completed		9/10/20

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions or a Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent: 9/10/20
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author: Sean Flesher, Chief Officer Parks & Countryside

Report of: Director of Communities and Environment

Portfolio: Environment and Active Lifestyles

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Close West Leeds Country Park Visitor Centre in Pudsey Park
2021/22 savings from proposal	£ 90k

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

The West Leeds Country Park is a 32km circular trail running from the city centre, through the green corridor of the Aire Valley around Calverley, south of Pudsey and into Armley and Wortley. The Visitor Centre is in the heart of Pudsey Park, is free to enter and is a registered zoo. It keeps captive indigenous species ranging from birds, mammals and fish and explains the different habitats in the park and how they benefit wildlife. In addition to public displays there is an education room and curriculum-linked guided tours and workshops are available for school or educational groups. The building has been closed to the public for over 6 months under Covid-19 restrictions and therefore the proposal would be to not re-open. There is a potential opportunity to repurpose or replace the existing buildings with a park cafe that could retain some of the educational elements of the visitor centre. This would require a business case for unsupported borrowing.

There would be savings of around £90k involving a reduction in 2 members of staff, plus casual staff, feed and veterinary costs along with the running costs of the building.

Impacts of proposal

The closure of the visitor centre is likely to be of concern to local interest groups in the west of Leeds. If a decision was taken to close the visitor centre then an alternative use by repurposing or replacing the existing buildings would be considered. There may be potential to redevelop the building or existing footprint as a café with a terrace and potentially some form of children's play (to replace the old play area currently located near to the bus station) which would need further investigation to determine feasibility. If a business case was developed then capital investment would need to be assessed and implemented via prudential borrowing or potentially utilise available S106 in the area. Should feasibility studies for alternative uses not support a robust business case then demolition and site clearance could be considered with the site landscaped into the surrounding community park.

Recommendations

Members are requested to:

- Consider the proposal to close West Leeds Country Park visitor centre in Pudsey Park.
- Approve the proposal going out to consultation as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.
- Note that James Rogers, the Director of Communities and Environment, will be responsible.

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: Communities and Environment	Service area: Parks and Countryside
Lead person: Simon Frosdick	Contact number: 3786002

1. Title:

Close West Leeds Country Park Visitor Centre in Pudsey Park

Is this a:

☐

Strategy / Policy

☒

Service / Function

☐

Other

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

There is a proposal to close the West Leeds Country Park visitor centre in Pudsey Park.

The West Leeds Country Park is a 32km circular trail running from the city centre, through the green corridor of the Aire Valley around Calverley, south of Pudsey and into Armley and Wortley. The Visitor Centre is in the heart of Pudsey Park, is free to enter and is a registered zoo displaying captive indigenous species ranging from birds, mammals and fish with explanations of how the different habitats in the park benefit wildlife.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?		x
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	x	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?	x	
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?	x	
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment• Advancing equality of opportunity• Fostering good relations		x

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?**
(**think about** the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

The closure of the visitor centre is likely to provoke considerable concern from members and other interest groups in the west of Leeds however charging for entry is not considered a viable option. If a decision was taken to close the visitor centre then an alternative use would need to be found by repurposing or replacing assuming that demolition was not considered. There may be potential to develop the building for other uses e.g. café with some form of children's play which would need further investigation to determine feasibility.

There are two staff based at the centre who undertake animal care who would need to be redeployed with a net reduction in service staffing.

- **Key findings**
(**think about** any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

The current usage of the building provides an education room and curriculum-linked guided tours and workshops available for school or educational groups.

- **Actions**
(**think about** how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

The educational support resources would still be available post closure of any fixed facility and could be delivered via other community based venues such as adjacent school, church and leisure centre spaces.

There is potential for educational elements to be retained within any change of use for the building such as a café which would be subject to a suitable business case.

This proposal would be subject to full public consultation ahead of taking any final decision.

5. If you are **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment**.**

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:

Date to complete your impact assessment

Lead person for your impact assessment
(Include name and job title)

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Sean Flesher	Chief Parks and Countryside Officer	12/10/20
Date screening completed		29/7/20

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Tony Stringwell

Report of: James Rogers, Director of Communities & Environment

Portfolio: Environment & Active Lifestyles

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Stop maintaining 50% of bowling greens and allow asset transfers to clubs willing to take responsibility.
2021/22 savings from proposal	£ 83k

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes

Executive Summary

Overview

In 2015 a report to Executive Board supported a review of the provision of crown green bowling in the city and agreed the following:

- The introduction of a charge which would mean an income recovery level of £62k in 2014/15 rising to £78k in 2017/18.
- The removal of 6 bowling greens from multiple green sites.

Following detailed consultation with the bowling association, the annual usage charge was based on what was considered and agreed by them to be a conservative number of bowlers in the city of 2,500. Following the introduction of these arrangements, the number of members that paid the season ticket was less than anticipated and has continued to decline since as shown in the following table:

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Number of Bowlers (adult equivalent)	1,829	1,710	1,586	1526	1427	1386
Income Attained	£45.5k	£46.2k	£46.0k	£47.3k	£44.2k	£45K

From this table in 2019 there were 1,386 bowlers. There are presently 62 outdoor bowling greens in Leeds that are currently maintained by Parks and Countryside at a cost of around £4k per green. This is largely made up of labour estimated at 9 FTE at a cost of £234k.

The proposal under consideration is to reduce the number of greens by 50%. This could be achieved through either community asset transfer or through the direct removal of greens. The individual greens to be closed have not been selected at this stage and this would be undertaken giving consideration to a range of factors including the spatial distribution of retained greens, numbers of players currently using an individual green and the ability to complete community asset transfers.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



There are potential asset management implications along with property services as some buildings could be declared surplus. The capital cost needs estimated (could be £20k per green to decommission).

Impacts of proposal

This proposal would impact on existing bowling clubs and it is anticipated that this may accelerate the progressive decline in participation levels. Conversely the consolidation of playing members may help improve the longer term sustainability of bowling clubs that remain through a greater sense of community and 'pull' factors. Whilst clubs are proactive in terms of competition participation, prior requests for clubs to be more engaged in terms of supporting green maintenance have been resisted. It is therefore anticipated that the uptake in community asset transfer will be low and that greens will need to be removed. Notwithstanding that, the established season ticket option means clubs would have an income streams that would support in sustaining their activities. Assuming that participation remains at present levels there would be sufficient supply of bowling greens remaining to sustain existing users.

A range of options could be explored to remove greens that would all essentially involve a low cost landscaped option to incorporate the land within the surrounding park area. Therefore the visual impact of this change would be modest and the proposal would fit well with climate change objectives as an intensively maintained area will be replaced with a more sustainable land management approach.

Recommendation(s)

Member are requested to:

- Consider the proposal to reduce the number of greens in Leeds by 50%. Deliver this change by offering clubs the opportunity to consider asset transfer or by removing greens.
- Approve the proposal going out to consultation as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.
- Note that James Rogers, the Director of Communities and Environment, will be responsible.

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: Communities and Environment	Service area: Parks and Countryside
Lead person: Mike Kinnaird	Contact number: 3786002

1. Title: Potential reduction in bowling greens maintained with asset transfers to clubs willing to take responsibility

Is this a:

☐

Strategy / Policy

☒

Service / Function

☐

Other

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

There is a proposal to stop maintaining 50% of bowling greens and allow asset transfers to clubs willing to take responsibility.

Leeds City Council is the major provider of outdoor bowling facilities in Leeds. The Parks and Countryside service currently maintain 62 greens with accompanying ancillary facilities. The Parks and Countryside service conduct all the horticultural maintenance work on these facilities. Bowls pavilions are also Leeds City Council assets.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?		x
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	x	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?	x	
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?	x	
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment• Advancing equality of opportunity• Fostering good relations		x

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

• **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?**
(think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

In 2015 a report to Executive Board supported a review of the provision of crown green bowling in the city and agreed the following:

- The introduction of a season ticket charge.
- The removal of 6 bowling greens from multiple green sites.

Following detailed consultation with the bowling association, the annual usage charge was based on what was considered and agreed by them to be a conservative number of bowlers in the city of 2,500. Following the introduction of these arrangements, the number of members that paid the season ticket was less than anticipated and has continued to decline since as shown in the following table:

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Number of Bowlers (adult equivalent)	1,829	1,710	1,586	1526	1427	1386

On the assumption that there are around 1400 bowling club members in Leeds sharing 62 greens, this represents a ratio of 22 bowlers to every green leaving scope for reductions or rationalisation.

• **Key findings**
(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

This proposal would impact on existing bowling clubs and it is anticipated that this may accelerate the progressive decline in participation levels. Conversely the consolidation of playing members may help improve the longer term sustainability of bowling clubs that remain through a greater sense of community and 'pull' factors. Whilst clubs are proactive in terms of competition participation, prior requests for clubs to be more engaged in terms of supporting green maintenance have been resisted. It is therefore anticipated that the uptake in community asset transfer will be low and that greens will need to be removed. Assuming that participation remains at present levels there would be sufficient supply of bowling greens remaining to sustain existing users.

- **Actions**

(think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

The options on which greens are removed will need to be determined on the basis of demand, accessibility and geography in consultation with bowling clubs and key stakeholders.

The potential for community asset transfers would need to be assessed on a site by site basis as some pavilions include shared usage as depots or changing facilities. Where a pavilion is exclusively used by the bowling club then this could be included along with the bowling green(s).

As indicated this proposal would be subject to full public consultation ahead of taking any final decision.

5. If you are **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment.****

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Sean Flesher	Chief Parks and Countryside Officer	12/10/20
Date screening completed		12/10/20

7. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions or a Significant Operational Decision.**

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.

- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Lee Hemsworth

Report of: Director of Communities and Environment

Portfolio: *Communities*

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Redesign of the Community Hub / Library model within the city
2021/22 savings from proposal	£457k

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	Yes
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	Yes – Attached.

Executive Summary

Overview

There are 20 Community Hubs and Libraries, plus 15 Community Libraries, 1 Central Library and 3 One Stop Centres in the city, employing 286 FTE many of which are part time staff in hubs, community libraries and one stop centres and 98 FTE in Central Library. Further to this there are 7 Mobile Community Hubs vehicles, employing 8 members of staff.

The services on offer within Community Hubs and Libraries range from helping people into work, money advice, benefits, council tax and housing. A range of partners also co-locate with us such as the Gambling Clinic, Victim Support, Volunteers Centre and Credit Union.

Likewise the mobile service provides a community hub service, as per the above, to 18 districts in the city. The service is offered where communities are more than 1 mile from a physical Community Hub / Library and/or are communities suffering from significant deprivation. The mobile offer also enables services to be delivered where specific events warrant council services being available for help and support. Further to this, there is also a mobile story bus which visits 10 locations per week to help improve childhood literacy. Plus a residential mobile library which takes the library service out to those that can't get to a physical building and this does 81 stops over a 2 week period. The mobile fleet was fully replaced in 2020 with the new mobile vehicles being delivered in January and February 2020. These were purchased with a capital investment of £1.5 million.

Libraries are a statutory service, overseen by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) The ambition for Public Libraries in England outlines the vision for the public libraries and highlights the 7 outcomes that are critical to individuals and communities that libraries positively contribute to:

- Cultural and creative enrichment
- Increase reading and literacy
- Improved digital access and literacy
- Helping everyone to achieve their full potential
- Healthier and happier lives
- Greater prosperity



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



- Stronger, more resilient communities

As a statutory service, any changes proposed around the number of libraries or changes to opening hours needs to have been informed by an assessment of need community consultation and the DCMS need to be kept informed of proposals

This Review has considered achieving budget savings through taking a lean and systems approach by undertaking a review of opening hours and staffing rotas with a view to streamlining provision across the city. The findings from the review will save £457k in 21/22, subject to agreement by staff and trade unions to the new rotas and revised working patterns, and through public consultation about proposals for the revised opening hours.

Impacts of proposal

This proposal will provide an overall net increase in total hours open in community hubs and libraries across the city (by 65.5) while achieving a significant budget saving. The proposal does assume the closure / transfer of 3 libraries (Gildersome, Whinmoor and Scholes) that have already been agreed in principle by Executive Board as part of the Community hub development programme, for this reason they are excluded from the review and there are no savings associated with these sites included. A formal process to address the closure / transfer of these 3 sites will be progressed so that a formal decision on their future can be made by 31st March 2021.

Given the above, the proposals will have some impact on the citizens of Leeds as it will alter the number of late night openings currently available in some sites and will remove Sunday openings at all sites. The proposals are likely to have a significant impact on some staff whose rota hours may change significantly.

Recommendation(s)

- Members are requested to consider the proposal to implement new opening hours and staffing rotas across the Community Hub and Library estate.
- This proposal will provide a financial saving £457k in 2021/22 and provides an appropriate balance between the need for delivering savings whilst maintaining as much access as possible for members of the public to vital community hub and library services
- Also to approve the proposal going out to consultation as part of the council's medium-term financial strategy and preparation for setting the 2021/22 Budget.
- And that the Director (Communities and Environment) will be responsible for the implementation of this saving proposal.

Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment - organisational change impacting on the workforce

As a public authority we need to ensure that all organisational change arrangements impacting on the workforce have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration. In all appropriate instances we will need to carry out an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment.

This form:

- can be used to prompt discussion when carrying out your impact assessment
- should be completed either during the assessment process or following completion of the assessment
- should include a brief explanation where a section is not applicable

Directorate: Communities and Environments	Service area: Face to face contact
Lead person: Susan Murray	Contact number: 07891271299
Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment: 08/10/2020	

2. Members of the assessment team:		
Name	Organisation	Role on assessment team For example, service user, manager of service, specialist
Susan Murray	LCC	Face to face contact head of service. Responsible for overseeing the service restructure
Nick Hart	LCC	Deputy Head of Service

3. Summary of the organisational change arrangements to be assessed:
Review of Library and Community Hub opening hours <p>This Review proposes a review of opening hours across Community Hubs and Libraries, to provide a more coherent pattern of opening that is easily communicated and understood by citizens. The current mixed bag of opening hours not only impacts on use and take up of service but is costly to resource due to the fact that staffing rota patterns are not interchangeable. Therefore, aligned to the review of opening hours is a review of the staff</p>

rota patterns which are required to deliver the new opening hours in the most cost effective manner. The proposed opening hour changes are as below:

	Current Open Hours	New Open Hours	Diff	No Late Nights	Open Sat	Open Sun
Central Library	58	58	0	4	Y	N
Tier one						
Compton	59	54	-5	4	Y	N
Moor Allerton	58	54	-4	4	Y	N
Armley	57	54	-3	4	Y	N
Headingley	57.5	54	-3.5	4	Y	N
Morley	49	54	5	4	Y	N
Tier two						
Chapel Allerton	42	48	6	1	Y	N
Crossgates	46	48	2	1	Y	N
Deacon House	51	48	-3	1	Y	N
Oakwood	40	48	8	1	Y	N
Reginald	44	48	4	1	Y	N
Wetherby	47	48	1	1	Y	N
Beeston	42	48	6	1	Y	N
Dewsbury Road	41	48	7	1	Y	N
Garforth	52	48	-4	1	Y	N
Halton	41	48	7	1	Y	N
Hunslet	42	48	6	1	Y	N
Kippax	44	48	4	1	Y	N
Rothwell	51	48	-3	1	Y	N
Middleton	49.5	48	-1.5	1	Y	N
Bramley	51	48	-3	1	Y	N
Aireborough	37	48	11	1	Y	N
Holt Park	48	48	0	1	Y	N
Horsforth	50	48	-2	1	Y	N
Otley	42	48	6	1	Y	N
Yeadon	47	48	1	1	Y	N
Tier three						
Farsley	26	30	4	0	Y	N
Calverley	21	30	9	0	Y	N
Ardsley & Tingley	19	19	0	0	Y	N
Boston Spa	19	19	0	0	Y	N
Burmantofts	37	37	0	0	N	N
Hawthorth	37	37	0	0	N	N
Seacroft South	37	37	0	0	N	N
Osmondthorpe	37	37	0	0	N	N
Total	992.5	1058	65.5	38		

This proposal would contribute to the following Best Council Plan priorities.

- An Efficient, Enterprising and Healthy organisation

4. Scope of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment	
Organisational change (please tick all appropriate boxes that apply below)	
Restructuring and assimilation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reorganisation and job redesign	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Flexible deployment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Early leavers initiative	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cessation of a service	<input type="checkbox"/>
Downsizing of a service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Switching	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recruitment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Equal pay considerations	<input type="checkbox"/>
Job evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other organisational change arrangements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please provide detail: Face to face services are undergoing a proposal to review the opening hours and shift patterns of the libraries and community hubs as defined in section 3. As part of the review there will be an anticipated reduction of 16.91 FTE posts. These will all be managed via the ELI scheme and no redundancies will be necessary.	

The review of hours will take an existing 42 shift patterns down to 7.

- 37 hours
- 20 hours
- 18.75 hours
- 18 hours
- 16 hours
- 14 hours
- 12 hours

This change will inevitably have an impact on staff in terms of a move from their existing agreed hours of work to one of the above patterns. The impact of this will be mitigated by:

-Making every effort to 'best match' staff to the most appropriate shift pattern, minimising any disruption/inconvenience/upset.

-Where possible meeting flexible working requests, however a review of shift patterns as proposed may impact the ability of the service to honour requests

-Consultations will take place with Trade Unions to ensure staff have appropriate representation and support

-Support will be offered by HR colleagues throughout consultation phase and actual implementation of the proposals

4a. Do your proposals relate to:
please tick the appropriate box below

The whole service	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific part of the service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
More than one service	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide detail:

This relates to libraries and Community hubs service only.

4b. Do your proposals relate to:
please tick the appropriate box below

Employment considerations only	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	--------------------------

Employment considerations and impact on service delivery	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> x </div>
<p>Please provide detail:</p> <p>The proposed rota and shift pattern changes will have an impact on employment considerations as there will be a reduction in 16.91 FTE posts. This will be managed via ELI and flexible retirement, there will be no redundancies</p> <p>Service delivery will be impacted positively as the proposed changes deliver savings whilst realising circa 65 additional opening hours across the city. Rationalising shift patterns ensure that effective rota systems can be put into place which can be more efficiently managed.</p> <p>Staff will be best matched to one of 7 shift patterns, there will be staff engagement sessions in advance of implementation and staff will have the opportunity to offer feedback and request the best fit shift available.</p> <p>Consultation will take place with T/U's to ensure their views are sought in advance of implementation and so staff have representation throughout the whole process.</p> <p>There will also be a public consultation which will take place to ensure the proposed changes are viewed positively by the community, and their collective voices are taken into account.</p>	

<p>5. Fact finding – what do we already know</p> <p>Make a note here of all information you'll be using to carry out this assessment. This could include previous consultation, involvement, research, results from perception surveys, equality monitoring and customer or staff feedback.</p> <p>(priority should be given to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration related information)</p> <p>Information used to carry out the assessment is set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement sessions will take place with staff around the proposed changes and the shift patterns that will subsequently be made available to them, the service will make every effort to match each member of staff to the 'best fit' option to suit their individual circumstances • A public consultation will take place to ensure the proposed opening hour changes fit with demand from the actual communities themselves • Consultation will take place with the Trade unions. Feedback from Trade Union colleagues and Trade Union members will be taken into account and will help to shape the proposals and their subsequent implementation. • HR advice has been taken and will help the service to ensure that implementation of the proposals is undertaken in a fair and transparent fashion. Staff will be required in some instances to move onto a new shift pattern. Staff who choose not to move onto one of the new shift patterns will be supported through the managing workforce

change procedure and be given access to redeployment pool.

- Staff have will be provided with timely information on the new proposals and will continue to have the opportunity to ask any questions or raise concerns prior to implementation.

Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information

Please provide detail:

Yes

Action required:

Equality data to show breakdown of workforce in terms of equality strands an analysis of this data will be needed so appropriate action can be taken to mitigate any potential negative impact

6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested

☒

Yes

☐

No

Please provide detail:

We will hold a number of service wide staff engagement sessions during which staff will be fully briefed about the changes. During these sessions we will listen to and document staff feedback around the model and this will be taken into account prior to implementation.

A series of open staff consultations will take place across the city in order to give people the opportunity to raise their concerns, ask any questions and where appropriate make suggestions or proposals of their own for how we move forward effectively. The feedback gained from these sessions will be taken into account and used to design a set of FAQ's for staff.

Feedback will also be fed into consultation meetings held with trade unions.

Trade unions will be given the opportunity to comment on and make amends to a shift pattern/rota changes report which defines all proposed changes. This will be done before the report is then made available to staff.

Action required:

Report to be presented to T/U's for feedback, comments and amends. Final version to be presented to staff in a series of staff engagement events to allow for open consultation and feedback.

7. Who may be affected by this activity?

please tick all relevant and significant equality characteristics, stakeholders and barriers that apply to your strategy, policy, service or function

Equality characteristics

☐

Age

☐

Carers

☐

Disability

☐

Gender reassignment

☐

Race

☐

Religion
or belief

☐

Sex (male or female)

☐

Sexual orientation

☒

Other

(for example – marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background, education or skills level)

Please specify: the proposal may affect any of the above depending upon the individual. Staff will need to move onto one of the proposed 7 shift patterns and not all will get their first choice (although the service will endeavour to allow this wherever possible)

Stakeholders

☐

Services users

☒

Employees

☒

Trade Unions

☐

Partners

☒

Members

☐

Suppliers

☐

Other please specify

Potential barriers

☐

Built environment

☐

Location of premises and services

☐

Information
and communication

☐

Customer care

☐

Timing

☐

Stereotypes and assumptions

☐

Cost

☒

Consultation and involvement

☐

Specific barriers to the organisational change proposals

Please specify

--

8. Positive and negative impact

Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers

8a. Positive impact:

The proposals will have a positive impact in several ways:

- The proposals will increase library opening hours across the city by 65 hours per week
- Customers will be able to recognise a clear and consistent set of opening hours across the majority of the sites
- The model retains Saturday and evening opening hours
- The proposals will allow the management and rota team to oversee site cover, annual leave and absence cover more efficiently – In turn reducing the number of requests for staff to cover at multiple sites/travel to cover/last minute cover requests etc. this has been a real issue to this point.
- The proposals will help the service to realise circa £400k saving per year which will contribute to one of the most challenging financial periods the council has ever faced.
- The proposal allows the service to make required savings without having to close branches/sites or seize service delivery which would impact communities heavily and result in heavy job losses
- Making savings in this way allows the service to avoid site/branch closures which could trigger costly and lengthy investigation by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Action required:

None

8b. Negative impact:

- The proposals will have a negative impact in several ways
- Not all staff will be happy with moving from their current hours onto a new shift pattern which may not suit them as well. However staff will wherever possible be best matched to their favoured shift pattern. And staff by the same token may also be very pleased with a new set of hours should they have wished to drop or increase from their current amount.

Action required:

- Input will be sought from the Trade Unions.
- The proposals will be implemented through input and guidance from HR.
- All appropriate adjustments will be discussed with relevant staff and implemented
- Staff will have the opportunity to speak in confidence to managers/ neutral officers about their concerns
- Timely information detailing the proposals will be disseminated in writing. Other methods of communication will be offered where needed e.g. verbal update
- This will be supplemented by Team briefings across the city, and one to ones. This will ensure that communications are equal across the service.
- Communications will reinforce the key messages. Why there is a need for the change. What the main changes are. The positive impact of the changes. What support is available to staff throughout these changes.

9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups or communities identified?

☒

Yes

☐

No

Please provide detail:

The proposals ultimately deliver a large amount of savings whilst increasing the amount of library hours the public have available to them (65 extra per week).

The public will have new clear and consistent set of opening hours meaning they have a similar offer regardless of the site they may choose to visit. This will reduce the amount of unsuccessful visits, keep services open longer and contribute further to several key agendas in the city e.g. reducing child poverty, Child Friendly City. This proposal would also contribute to the following Best Council Plan priorities.

- An Efficient, Enterprising and Healthy organisation

Action required:

None

10. Does this activity bring groups or communities into increased contact with each other (for example in schools, neighbourhood or the workplace)?

☒

Yes

☐

No

Please provide detail:

The delivery of the Community Hubs and Libraries model in Leeds offers many different methods of support to customers/residents, integrating services in this way enables Leeds

<p>City Council to keep frontline services running (other local authorities are choosing to close down library and one stop services due to budgetary pressures). This proposal safeguards that offer, whilst allowing the necessary savings to be made. Moreover the proposal increases the number of hours libraries are open across the city and introduces a new consistency which is easy for customers to engage with and understand.</p> <p>An additional 65 hours opening per week allows for more interaction and engagement between community members, partners and key stakeholders</p>
<p>Action required:</p> <p>None</p>

<p>11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another?</p>
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No </div> </div> <p>Please provide detail:</p> <p>All staff will have the opportunity to request their preferred shift pattern, and the service will make every effort to best match them to this</p> <p>All staff will be consulted with in advance of implementation and have the chance to feedback comments and ideas.</p> <p>All staff will have support from T/U's and HR colleagues</p>
<p>Action required:</p> <p>To ensure continued opportunity for staff to consult with managers about the proposed changes are offered.</p> <p>To offer redeployment opportunity to staff not wishing to remain with the service following the implementation of the new proposals.</p> <p>To work with Trade Union colleagues to ensure staff feel supported during a time of change.</p>

12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
Consultation with staff to continue in advance of service re structure implementation	This will commence in the form of several area wide meetings held across the city. Staff will have an ongoing opportunity to speak with service managers and the head of service	To mitigate any concerns or stress that staff may be experiencing following the announcement of the new proposals To ensure effective communication flow for all that are impacted by the proposed changes	Community Hub Managers Head of Service Trade Union's Human Resources
Development and publishing of a set of FAQ's that's staff can access at any time (these have been developed following a series of consultations already held with staff)	TBC	To enable staff to refresh on the answers given to any concerns raised in consultation meetings. To enable online communication, and to offer a more comprehensive level of access to support and guidance	Head of service Community Hub Managers
Continued consultation and negotiations to take place with trade union colleagues to ensure the views of the wider workforce are taken into account and considered fairly	Immediate and will be ongoing throughout	This ensure the workforce have a voice and that they are listened to and effectively represented.	Head of Service HR Trade Unions

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
To continue to take advice and guidance from Council HR colleagues to ensure the correct support measures and guidance are in place for staff affected by the proposed changes	ongoing	To ensure correct advice and guidance is being offered in line with Council policy and procedure	HR
Gather and analyse workforce equality data to determine if there are any groups of people in terms of protected characteristics that will be disproportionately affected.	Jan 21	To enable fair monitoring and evaluation	HR
To offer redeployment opportunity to staff not wanting to take up new job roles offered as part of the re structure	March/April 2021	To offer alternative options to staff	HR

13. Governance, ownership and approval

State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment

Name	Job title	Date
Lee Hemsworth	Chief Officer – Customer Access and welfare	8/10/2020
Date impact assessment completed		8/10/2020

14. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions (please tick)

- ☒ As part of service planning performance monitoring
- ☐ As part of project monitoring
- ☐ Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board
Please specify which board
- ☐ Other (please specify)

15. Publishing

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality impact assessment should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality impact assessments that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached assessment was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Service review report

Report to: Executive Board

Date of meeting: 21st October 2020

Report author(s): Gemma Taskas

Report of: Director Resources & Housing

Portfolio: Resources (Cllr James Lewis)

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? No

Proposal title:	Reducing the Wage Bill
2021/22 savings from proposal	£ TBC

Who are you expecting to consult with?	Service users?	N / A
	Staff?	Yes
	Other stakeholders?	Yes – Trade Union Colleagues

Are there equalities implications?	Yes
If yes, have you attached a screening document?	No – to be considered in each Service Review

Executive Summary

Overview

The Council's largest area of spend is on the workforce with an annual wage bill in excess of £550m excluding Schools. A 'Framework for Staffing Costs Reductions' has already been developed, which sets out 4 key steps to support reducing the Council's wage bill and contributing to the current financial gap from a workforce perspective. Steps 1-3 have already been implemented which predominately relate to voluntary interventions. This report focuses on options to progress in relation to step 4 – whereby compulsory measures are taken. These interventions relate to compulsory redundancies, changes to employment terms and conditions of service and reform of our pay arrangements/structures. Pursuant to employment legislation and our "Managing Staff Reductions" collective procedure, these compulsory measures are considered should the voluntary measures not deliver the required financial savings.

Impacts of proposal

All the enclosed proposals would result in a diminution to either the number of staff employed in the council or the pay and benefits of those staff remaining in employment. There are very many elements of our extant pay and conditions framework that could be changed in order to realise the financial savings. To support this complex decision-making process, we should remain mindful of the Council's Values and the new long-term People Strategy that sets out our ambition to be the 'best place to work'. As such we should endeavour to ensure that the proposals remain cognisant of the following ambitions:

- Ensuring that the Council's employment and pay offer remains fair and competitive so it can attract, retain and engage a sustainable and talented workforce.
- Promotes staff health, safety and wellbeing.
- Delivers our commitments towards to the Real Living Wage and the Gender Pay Gap.
- Promotes workforce diversity, and ensuring all proposals are fully equality impact assessed.



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



- Encourages workforce flexibility and agility so that the Council is able to adapt to inevitable contextual change.
- Supports employee engagement and commitment, and wherever possible promotes constructive and positive relationships with trade unions, staff networks and other partner and city organisations.

The proposals are themed around **three** areas:

- A. Changes to the existing organisational design principles to be more explicit on spans of control and structural tiers. Revised principles are at annexe 1 to this report.
- B. Changes to senior staffing structures
- C. Changes to terms and conditions of employment

Recommendation(s)

Executive Board are asked to:

- I. Consider and agree the following as a recommended proposal to take forward:
 - Agreement to the revised organisational design principles and the implementation of these principles through the service review process over the next 6 / 12 months.
 - Through application of these principles seek to deliver at least a 10% reduction in the senior staff cohort (JNC staff).
 - Seek to undertake localised changes to terms and conditions in agreed services.
- II. Note that, where voluntary measures do not deliver the required workforce reductions set out above and in the already agreed Service Reviews, consultation on compulsory redundancies will take place with Trade Unions and affected staff in line with the Council's Managing Staff Reductions Policy.
- III. Note that further proposals, in addition to those outlined above, will be brought forward to Executive Board in November for further consideration



BEST COUNCIL – MEETING OUR FINANCIAL CHALLENGE



Annexe 1 – Revised Organisation Design Principles

These organisation design principles provide a framework to ensure a consistent approach to structural change, where it is needed. They are intended to be the ‘golden principles’ used to inform and shape any future service review to ensure organisation structures are fit for purpose, sustainable and demonstrate that we are spending money wisely. The organisation design principles are not intended to set pay rates. Grades will be determined by role responsibilities and accountabilities. The Council’s approach to setting Senior Pay is set out in the Annual Pay Policy Statement.

1. Structures will be simpler, flatter and more streamlined to improve customer service, efficiency and support delivery of the Best Council and Best City outcomes. This will help employees respond to customer issues, provide exciting opportunities and job variety and enable all staff to be more motivated and clearer about the contribution they are making.
2. Hierarchical tiers will be reduced between the Chief Executive and frontline service delivery to help structures be more customer focused. Typically, there will be no more than 9 tiers in a structure and at leadership and management levels this would typically result in 3 leadership tiers at JNC level including Directors.
3. Management spans of control will be determined by the nature and complexity of the work and management of risk. Ideally, aiming for a span of control with a maximum of 10 colleagues wherever possible. Typically there will not be any 1:1 line management ratios.
4. Structures will be designed to maximise service integration and collaboration from a customer or locality perspective.
5. Flexible career paths and agile working opportunities will be developed to enable people to work more flexibly across the organization, which will be supported by a proactive development routes.

It is recognised that there is no ‘one size fits all’ approach; however, these principles demonstrate how the Council intends to adapt its organisation shape to deliver savings and our ambitions as set out in the Best Council Plan