

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**SCIA 15 (15/16)**

Chief Officer:	Chief Officer Communities & Business	Service:	Community Safety
Activity	Youth	No. of Staff:	0.1 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Wages – basic pay (a)	(2)	Ongoing
Efficiency savings (b & c)	(8)	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

- (a) As the Youth Zone programme is now delivered in partnership with the voluntary sector we have a reduced need for casual staff.
- (b) A significant amount of Safeguarding training has been completed this year and a reduced budget will be sufficient to top up training in future years.
- (c) Following reductions in Youth Development staff some years ago we have found other ways to undertake major events and now work with other providers and partners to deliver such events which means we have been able to make savings in previous years.

Key Stakeholders Affected

No negative effect

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

No negative effect

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	48	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	-	Youth Development forms part of Strategic Plans such as the Community Safety Strategy, Health Improvement Plan, Community Plan and Economic Development Plan.		
Net Cost	48			

**Equality Impacts**

Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty:		
Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to disadvantage or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	No impact on service provision.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	No	
c. What steps can be taken to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		n/a

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**SCIA 16 (15/16)**

Chief Officer:	Chief Officer Communities & Business	Service:	Community Safety
Activity	Community Safety	No. of Staff:	3.3 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Equipment and Materials	(5)	ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

This saving will come from a reduction in project costs, including printed information following greater emphasis on website and e-communication, and graffiti removal materials, following reduction in graffiti.  
Wherever possible, external funding is applied for to ensure that projects continue to be delivered.

Key Stakeholders Affected

There should be no adverse effect on services.

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

These savings are achievable without adverse impacts because of the reduction in printing and paper costs associated with projects and publicity, together with a reduction in graffiti removal materials that are associated with the reduction in reports of graffiti.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	179	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	-	LPICD001: Percentage of Community Safety Partnership actions achieved	98%	85%
Net Cost	179			

**Equality Impacts**

Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty:		
Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to disadvantage or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	No impact on service provision.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	No	
c. What steps can be taken to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**SCIA 17 (15/16)**

Chief Officer:	Chief Housing Officer	Service:	Housing Advice
Activity	Bed and Breakfast	No. of Staff:	1.7 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
B&B savings for one year 2015/16	(10)	This will be a one off to be reviewed again next year

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

£10,000 savings has been identified for 2015/16 as successful proactive schemes to avoid homelessness have removed the need for B&B except for emergencies. This is a one year saving as we need to see the impact of the welfare reform and universal credit going forward.

Key Stakeholders Affected

Homeless people

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

There is no risk to homeless households because if the need for B&B drastically increased we will use some external funding.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	121	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	(25)	LPIHSA004: No. of households living in B&B	1	20
Net Cost	96			

**Equality Impacts**

Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty:		
Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to disadvantage or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	The client group are vulnerable due to the fact they are homeless. The Council has been successful in avoiding evictions and drastically reducing the need for B&B except in emergencies. B&B is not the best type of temporary accommodation for homeless people. This will be reviewed next year.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	No	
c. What steps can be taken to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		By being proactive to avoid evictions and to make available more suitable alternatives.

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**SCIA 18 (15/16)**

Chief Officer:	Chief Housing Officer	Service:	Housing Advice
Activity	Private Sector Letting Scheme	No. of Staff:	6.22 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Private Sector Letting (PSL)	(10)	To reduce budget for one year 15/16 and then review.

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

The PSL scheme is very successful and assists with rent in advance and deposit bonds to enable people to rent in the private sector.

The PSL Officer has been successful in recovering costs and where appropriate we have maximised Discretionary Housing Payment (DHP) to pay for this, with the result that the budget is able to make a saving for one year. This will not be permanent but will be reviewed again next year to see the effect of Welfare Reform and Universal Credit.

Key Stakeholders Affected

Homeless people

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

No adverse impact due to DHP and external funding available if necessary to top up the reduced budget.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	464	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	(17)	-		
Net Cost	447			

## Equality Impacts

Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty:		
Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to disadvantage or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	This does not reduce the availability of the PSL scheme. This will be reviewed after one year to determine if there is any greater need due to Welfare Reform and Universal Credit.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	No	
c. What steps can be taken to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		Reviewing the situation and maximising DHP where appropriate and topping up with external funding for a short period if needed.



**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT****SCIA 19 (15/16)**

Chief Officer:	Chief Housing Officer	Service:	Housing Standards
Activity	Disabled Facility Grants (DFG)	No. of Staff:	n/a

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Reduced revenue contribution to capital budgets	(50)	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

The DFG service was brought in house in December 2013 and there have been underspends in recent years. In addition, we have received increased funding from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and this has created underspends on the SDC portion of the budget. It is therefore the view that the service can be sustained with a £50,000 capital saving on going.

WKHA ring fenced DFG funding remains the same.

Key Stakeholders Affected

Older and disabled people

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)

No adverse impacts on the service as this underspend has occurred over the last couple of years. Although we will promote the service there will be sufficient budget to meet the need.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

**SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	517	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	(410)	LPIHSS001: No. of DFG's approved.	19	20
Net Cost	107			

## Equality Impacts

Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty:		
Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to disadvantage or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	The budget for DFGs is for older and or disabled people and has been underspent in recent years. Increased funding is being received from DCLG, therefore the client group will not be affected with this saving. The service will be promoted but there will still be sufficient funding to meet the need.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	No	
c. What steps can be taken to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		A review of the DFG service is being undertaken and the pilot of running it in house will now be extended until June 2015 (as there have been staffing vacancies).