

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

SCIA 1 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Chief Finance Officer	Service:	All services with staff
Activity	All activities with staff	No. of Staff:	362.93 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Employers National Insurance increase from 06/04/16	-	£200,000 from 2016/17 ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

The Government has introduced a single tier pension from 2016 which will mean the abolition of 'contracting out'. To fund this change, all employees will pay A Rate National Insurance and employer National Insurance Band D contributions will increase from 10.4% to 13.8%.

Key Stakeholders Affected

None

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

All services with staff will face an increased cost to pay for the additional employers National Insurance contributions. This change will add 1.5% to the cost of staffing.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	888	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	-	n/a		
Net Cost	888			

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	It is unlikely that this increase in cost would make any individual services unviable.
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 2 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Corporate Support	Service:	Property & Facilities Management (FM)
Activity	Estates Management	No. of Staff:	3.65 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Rental income which not be achieved, due to disposals or vacant properties.	48	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

A review of rental income has been completed taking into account recent disposals and vacant properties. This includes 27-37 High Street, Swanley being vacant, pending disposal or redevelopment, where rental and service charge income was previously £35,066.

Capital receipts have been obtained for properties that have been disposed of.

Key Stakeholders Affected

None

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

Rental income to the Property & FM Budget will reduce by £48,000 per annum ongoing, as a consequence.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	97	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	(163)	n/a		
Net Cost	(66)	n/a		

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 reduction in income has no impact on different groups in the community.
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 3 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Corporate Support	Service:	Property & Facilities Management (FM)
Activity	Estates Management	No. of Staff:	3.65 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Loss of fee income from Stag Theatre - FM Management	14	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service	<p>Following the retirement of Joe Burrows from the Property Team, the work which he undertook managing the mechanical and electrical (M&E) maintenance for the Stag Theatre, can no longer be delivered. Joe had previously worked on the installation of the M&E services at the Stag and therefore had specific knowledge for which the Stag retained his services via SDC.</p> <p>Therefore, the fees of £14,000 which SDC charged the Charity which runs the Stag Theatre are no longer able to be charged.</p>
---	--

Key Stakeholders Affected	None
---------------------------	------

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)	Fees and charges income to the Property & FM Budget will reduce by £14,000 per annum from now on, as a consequence.
--	---

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)	Low
--	-----

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	97	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	(163)	n/a		
Net Cost	(66)	n/a		

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 reduction in income has no impact on different groups in the community.
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 4 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Corporate Support	Service:	IT Services
Activity	Software Maintenance	No. of Staff:	12 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Microsoft Software Licence Costs	45	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

The Council purchases its Microsoft Licensing through an agreed government buying framework called the 'Public Sector Agreement 2009'. This framework agreement was negotiated between Microsoft UK, the Cabinet Office and the Office of Government Commerce (now Crown Commercial Service) in 2009.

The agreement allowed local authorities to purchase Microsoft Software Licensing through the framework at a fixed price for either 3, 4 or 5 years. This Council opted to use the 4 year fixed price model which could be extended for a further 12 months. This contract started on the 1st August 2011 and is scheduled to end on the 31st July 2015, the opportunity to exercise a 12 month extension will not be used as the new PSA14 / PSA15 agreement between Microsoft and Central Government will enable the Council to make use of new Cloud based technologies like Office 365.

The increase in price of Microsoft Licensing has been caused because of the following two reasons:

1. Prices have been locked at 2011 levels and were not linked to inflation
2. Under the PSA 2012 agreement, Sterling and Euro pricing were adjusted and owing to a weak pound meant that the cost of Microsoft Licensing within the UK substantially increased
3. Microsoft no longer offer 'per device' licensing which the Council is currently using. Device licensing at the time was slightly more expensive than 'per user' but the number of devices in use was about 40% less than the number of users on the system which made it a more affordable option.

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4. Microsoft are now providing more value added services, for example Office 365 and mobile device management as part of the core license.

Key Stakeholders Affected

All users of Council IT systems

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

Failure to account for this increase in budget will result in a net overspend on future revenue budgets.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Medium

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	764	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	0	n/a		
Net Cost	764			

Equality Impacts

Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty:		
Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
d. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to disadvantage or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	This growth item will allow frontline services to continue to operate in the same way they do at present.
e. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	No	
f. What steps can be taken to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

SCIA 5 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Corporate Support	Service:	IT Services
Activity	Code of Connection compliance	No. of Staff:	12 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
IT system security products	32	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service	<p>The IT network at Sevenoaks District Council is connected to a central government network called the 'Public Service Network' or 'PSN' for short.</p> <p>The network enables the secure transfer of information between local and central government departments. The connection is heavily used by Revenues and Benefits, Electoral Registration and is frequently used by IT, Finance and Customer Services.</p> <p>In order to connect to the PSN, Councils must ensure that their IT security meets Central Government requirements. The Council was already meeting many of these; however there were some areas where new systems and processes have had to be implemented. These new systems have resulted in an increased revenue cost.</p>
---	--

Key Stakeholders Affected	All users of Council IT systems
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)	Failure to account for this increased cost will result in a net overspend in future years. Not complying with Central Government requirements will result in our disconnection from the PSN and a resultant adverse impact on public services.
--	--

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

High

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	764	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	0	n/a		
Net Cost	764			

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	If this change is not implemented, the Council would be disconnected from the PSN which will result in out of date Benefits information being used which would mean that customers may not receive the amounts they are entitled to.
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 7 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Chief Finance Officer	Service:	Treasury Management
Activity	Debit and credit card fees	No. of Staff:	n/a

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Increased cost of debit and credit card transactions	10	ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

A fee is payable for each debit and credit card transaction. Use of these payment methods by council customers to pay for services continues to rise. This fee is not currently passed on to customers as we do not wish to discourage payment and it generally remains a cheaper option than paying by cash.

Key Stakeholders Affected

All customers who pay for council services.

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

No impact

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	56	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	-	n/a		
Net Cost	56			

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	Offering a range of payment methods reduces the likelihood of different groups being unable to pay.
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 8 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Environmental & Operational Services	Service:	Parks Rural
Activity	Countryside	No. of Staff:	1

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Loss of income	28	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

Due to agreed sale of Timberden Farm, Shoreham, loss of Farm Business Tenancy rent [£10,330 p.a.] and loss of Countryside Stewardship grant [£15,000 p.a.].
Loss of income from single payments scheme for Folly Field and Riverside, Edenbridge [£3,000 p.a.].

Key Stakeholders Affected

Farm Business tenant

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

Loss of income only. Sale of Timberden farm will attract a capital receipt.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	107	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	(33)	N/A		
Net Cost	74			

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	
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 9 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Chief Finance Officer	Service:	Misc. Finance
Activity	Business Rates – Discretionary Relief	No. of Staff:	n/a

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Business Rates – Discretionary Relief budget no longer required	(106)	ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

When the Council previously awarded 20% discretionary relief to businesses, the Council paid a proportion of it. Since the change to the business rates retention scheme, any discretionary relief awarded is charged to the Collection Fund and the Council receives its share of the total business rates collected. A separate budget for this purpose is therefore no longer required.

Key Stakeholders Affected

None

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

None as the change in regulations has resulted in a different treatment of discretionary relief for business rates.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	106	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	-	n/a		
Net Cost	106			

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 change in regulations has resulted in a different treatment of discretionary relief for business rates. This has no impact on business rates customers.
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 10 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Chief Finance Officer	Service:	Corporate Management
Activity	External Audit fees	No. of Staff:	n/a

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
External Audit fees reduction	(30)	Until 2017/18 when a new contract is awarded

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service	Grant Thornton were awarded the external audit contract for the South East England region from 2013/14 until 2017/18. This has resulted in the audit of the annual accounts being completed at a reduced cost and the cost of auditing grant claims is also reducing due to the improvements made by the Benefits Service. These reductions have been reported to the Audit Committee.
---	--

Key Stakeholders Affected	None.
---------------------------	-------

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)	None.
--	-------

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)	Low
--	-----

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	130	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	-	n/a		
Net Cost	130			

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.
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 11 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Chief Finance Officer	Service:	Revenues, Benefits, Audit, Anti-Fraud, Environmental Health
Activity	Partnerships with Dartford Borough Council	No. of Staff:	60.26 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Revised split of partnership costs between Sevenoaks DC and Dartford BC	(90)	One-off

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service	<p>As part of the agreements with Dartford BC, cost sharing arrangements are reviewed annually and revised if there is a significant change in activity levels between the partners.</p> <p>In recent years, activity levels in Benefits in particular have changed due to the demographic differences between the two authorities resulting in the number of benefit changes increasing at a greater rate in Dartford BC.</p> <p>As the economic position improves, activity levels may return to their original levels. This is why the saving is only included for one year but will be reviewed during each annual budget process.</p>
--	--

Key Stakeholders Affected	Dartford BC
----------------------------------	-------------

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)	None.
---	-------

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)	Low
---	-----

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost*	3,058	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	-	n/a		
Net Cost	3,058			

*SDC contribution to the partnership hub costs.

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 saving has no impact on service levels.
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 13 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Corporate Support	Service:	Property & Facilities Management (FM)
Activity	Central Offices	No. of Staff:	3.65 fte

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Argyle Road Rental Income	(18)	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service

Increased income derived from the rental of surplus capacity within the Argyle Road offices to MOAT Housing and Kent County Council.

Key Stakeholders Affected

None

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

Rental income to the Property budget will increase by £18,000 per annum ongoing.

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)

Low

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	484	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	(35)	n/a		
Net Cost	449	n/a		

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 increase in income has no impact on different groups in the community.
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 14 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Chief Finance Officer	Service:	Revenues
Activity	Revenues Court Costs	No. of Staff:	n/a

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Increased Revenues Court costs income	(25)	ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service	In recent years an increased number of summonses have been issued due to non-payment of Council Tax and Business Rates. Resources within the Revenues Service have been moved to increase the recovery function and the costs are a legitimate charge to cover the work required to recover this income.
---	--

Key Stakeholders Affected	This additional income is due to an increase in volume, not an increased charge so there is no additional impact on stakeholders.
---------------------------	---

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)	This change takes into account current volumes, which may change over time and impact on the ability to collect the total amount.
--	---

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)	Medium
--	--------

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	999	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	(276)	n/a		
Net Cost	723			

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	Residents who do not pay their Council Tax are liable to be taken to court if officers consider it to be the correct course of action. This SCIA does not change the current situation.
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 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
d. 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.
e. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	No	
f. 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	<p>The PSL scheme is very successful and assists with rent in advance and deposit bonds to enable people to rent in the private sector.</p> <p>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.</p>
---	--

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).

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

SCIA 20 (15/16)

Chief Officer:	Environmental & Operational Services	Service:	Environmental Health
Activity	Air Quality Monitoring	No. of Staff:	n/a

Activity Budget Change	2015/16 Growth / (Saving) £000	Later Years Comments (ongoing, one-off, etc.)
Reduced use of Consultants and outside contractors	(a) (18) or (b) (13)	Ongoing

Reasons for and explanation of proposed change in service	Recommendation by the Housing & Community Safety Advisory Committee to reduce the budget to £40,000 p.a. [a saving of £18,000 p.a.] or £45,000 p.a. [a saving of £13,000 p.a. to reflect actual current spend on air quality monitoring over the last 3 years]
---	--

Key Stakeholders Affected	District wide service
---------------------------	-----------------------

Likely impacts and implications of the change in service (include Risk Analysis)	Routine statutory responsibilities should not be effected, but if exceedances of pollutants are recorded following an updating and screening assessment and through routine monitoring and it is necessary to appoint consultants to undertake a detailed assessment leading to the declaration of an air quality management area, the budget maybe exceeded in that year.
--	--

Risk to Service Objectives (High / Medium / Low)	M
--	---

SERVICE CHANGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2014/15 Budget	£'000	Performance Indicators		
Operational Cost	58	Code & Description	Actual	Target
Income	0	N/A		
Net Cost	58			

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	
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?		.