

# HOUSING STRATEGY & OPTIONS DIVISION

## DRAFT BUDGET STRATEGY

2011/12 – 2013/14

### CONTENTS

Section 1	Divisional Summary	
Section 2	Risk Analysis	
Section 3	Equality Impact Assessment Summary	
Section 4	Summary List of Growth & Reduction Items	
Section 5	Growth Proformas	
Section 6	Reduction Proformas	
Section 7	EIA Proformas	

## **Housing (General Fund) Services : Division Summary OSMB**

Housing general fund services will be adversely affected by severe reductions in capital ( see report to Cabinet on the Housing Capital Programme ) reductions in government resources for the Homes and Community Agency , reductions in former Supporting People funds and the overall reduction in formula grant to the Council. The proposed budget strategy is:

1. Reconfigure a much reduced decent homes service to low income owner occupiers by targeting Adult Social Care clients in support of prevention and independent living:
  - End Home Improvement Areas and Home Maintenance grants and replace with £500k loans budget for loans only (Cabinet previously agreed a loans/grant strategy).
  - Retain Homehandy Person Service.
  - Continue Home Maintenance Advice Service.
  - Adopt new approach to requests for home adaptations.
  
2. Use part of the government's new Empty Homes Bonus homes to continue to tackle the wasted resource of private sector empty homes.
  
3. Continue to seek all possible ways of increasing the amount of affordable housing in the city, but with a reduced housing development team. Work with Homes and Community Agency, Housing Associations and private landlords and developers.
  
4. Find efficiency savings in the Housing Options Service but ensure we still meet statutory duties which are to:
  - provide advice to all to prevent homelessness
  - determine homelessness declarations
  - keep Housing Register.

Continue to provide:

- a single access point to Council hostels
- Mortgage Rescue Scheme.

Continue to improve services including:

- redesign Housing Options website to encourage self help and empower community advisors
  
- extend single access point to cover all Voluntary Sector hostels to improve the efficient use of hostel bed spaces.

5. To focus the reduced STAR service on the most vulnerable, maintaining the local presence in six neighbourhoods and increasing input into the new

Revolving Door Service which gives focused intensive support to single people who have repeat stays in hostels.

6. To embed the new way of working in hostels called Pathway Planning which seeks to support single homeless people into more sustainable independent tenancies, reducing the overall length of stay in hostels and focusing hostel support on those in most need. Retain Upper Tichbourne street hostel during the period of uncertainty that we face around single homelessness in the City. However , recognising that hostels are not the best way to help many of the single homeless in the city develop the Revolving Door Service, which will provide focused support on those individuals who have been in our hostel more than once over the last two years, so that these people succeed when they next leave the hostel.
  
7. Rationalise a small number of voluntary sector grants to focus on those most directly supporting the prevention of homelessness. The following projects will continue to be supported: YASC at Dawn Centre (with reduced grant) The Centre Project (assists vulnerably housed) ASK (Domestic Violence Project) Leicestershire Cares (routes into employment), Anchor Centre. Grant will be withdrawn from Homeless Health Care, TRAM (an employment project) and two internal services: Study support and Family support at Border House due to reduced demand, and two posts in Rough Sleeper Outreach.

Ann Branson  
8.02.2011

## Division Summary Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposals result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> Broadly, the cuts in homelessness services are most likely to impact on white males, the cuts in decent homes work on black and ethnic minorities and the cuts in new affordable homes across all the ethnic groups.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> The overall strategy for general fund housing services is to mitigate impact by further focusing services on the most vulnerable. In Leicester all the ethnic groups suffer from housing problems, though the nature of the issues is different reflecting household and tenure differences.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	The ending of the existing Home Improvement Areas and the programme for future HIA's affects particular areas of the city. Ethnic minorities tended to predominate in early parts of the programme with more mixed ethnic areas in later years .
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposals result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	White males are the main users of single person hostel bedspaces. The number of single men who are vulnerably housed in the community or rough sleeping may increase.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> The work on Pathway planning and the Revolving door Service seeks to give more targeted support to frequent hostel users.
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> Because the council has statutory housing duties towards those with disabilities and the strategy is to focus on those most in need it is not considered likely that disabled people will suffer disproportionately .
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or</b>

	<b>remove the negative impact?</b> n/a
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Greater competition for scarce housing resources has become a source of community tension in other cities. Reduced support for the vulnerably housed may result in more family conflict, domestic violence , ASB, drug and alcohol use and rough sleeping.

### **Budget implementation risk assessment**

#### **LOW RISK:**

1. STAR There are sufficient staff on temporary contracts across the service to allow achieving the budget savings quickly. ( Notice periods may vary)
2. All the proposed grant aid reductions contracts can be ended. Notices are being prepared.
3. Planning for staff reviews to achieve other internal reductions are underway.

## Division Summary Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposals result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> Broadly, the cuts in homelessness services are most likely to impact on white males, the cuts in decent homes work on black and ethnic minorities and the cuts in new affordable homes across all the ethnic groups.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> The overall strategy for general fund housing services is to mitigate impact by further focusing services on the most vulnerable. In Leicester all the ethnic groups suffer from housing problems, though the nature of the issues is different reflecting household and tenure differences.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	The ending of the existing Home Improvement Areas and the programme for future HIA's affects particular areas of the city. Ethnic minorities tended to predominate in early parts of the programme with more mixed ethnic areas in later years .
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposals result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	White males are the main users of single person hostel bedspaces. The number of single men who are vulnerably housed in the community or rough sleeping may increase.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> The work on Pathway planning and the Revolving door Service seeks to give more targeted support to frequent hostel users.
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> Because the council has statutory housing duties towards those with disabilities and the strategy is to focus on those most in need it is not considered likely that disabled people will suffer disproportionately .

	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>n/a</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p>Greater competition for scarce housing resources has become a source of community tension in other cities.  Reduced support for the vulnerably housed may result in more family conflict, domestic violence , ASB, drug and alcohol use and rough sleeping.</p>

**Budget Growth & Reduction Proposals - Housing Strategy & Options Division**

		<b>2011/12 £000</b>	<b>2012/13 £000</b>	<b>2013/14 £000</b>
HGF	<b>Growth Proposals</b>			
G1	Reduction in 2010/11 Hostel Budget Growth	200.0	200.0	200.0
G2	Housing Renewal re Capital Reduction	77.0	77.0	77.0
G5	Homelessness Grant Additional Resource	72.6	72.6	72.6
G6	Loss of net contribution from closure of hostels	0.0	70.2	70.2
	<b>Total Growth</b>	<b>349.6</b>	<b>419.8</b>	<b>419.8</b>
HGF	<b>Reduction Proposals</b>			
R2	Premises and Running Costs	16.8	16.8	16.8
R3	Empty Homes Bonus - Additional Income		(50.0)	(50.0)
R4	Housing Development	(105.0)	(105.0)	(105.0)
R5	Housing Options	(173.8)	(173.8)	(173.8)
	<b>Total Reductions</b>	<b>(262.0)</b>	<b>(312.0)</b>	<b>(312.0)</b>
	<b>Net Growth (Reduction)</b>	<b>87.6</b>	<b>107.8</b>	<b>107.8</b>

	<b>Homelessness Grant (specific, non-ringfenced) Proposals have no impact on General Fund</b>			
G3	Upper Tichbourne St Hostel	332.0	332.0	332.0
G4	Revolving Door Service	85.0	85.0	85.0
R7	Roughsleeper Outreach	(30.0)	(30.0)	(30.0)
R8	Y Advice and Support Centre	(26.4)	(26.4)	(26.4)
R9	Homeless Health Care	(22.3)	(22.3)	(22.3)
R10	Border House Family Support	(62.6)	(62.6)	(62.6)
R11	TRAM (STRIDE)	(23.2)	(23.2)	(23.2)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>252.5</b>	<b>252.5</b>	<b>252.5</b>

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Hostels		<b>Proposal No: G1</b>		
<b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b>				
A budget growth in 2009/10 to cover reduction in grant aid was due to end . This proposal is to continue the budget growth to avoid further reductions in general fund housing services.				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Other				
<b><u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
n/a				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
Date: 1/4/2011				
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs				
Income				
<b>Net Total</b>		200	200	200
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11**

**Individual Pro-formas for growth and reduction proposals**

<b>SERVICE AREA Housing Renewal and Options</b>		<b>Proposal No: G2</b>		
<b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b>				
To deal with reduction in fee income and the ability to captilise costs associated with the renewal programme .( most of the impact has been contained by reducing staffing) The growth will prevent the need to make further cuts elsewhere in essential housing general fund services				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Other				
<b><u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
Date: 1/4/2011				
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs				
Income				
<b>Net Total</b>		77	77	77
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11**

<b>SERVICE AREA HOSTELS</b>		<b>Proposal No: G3</b>		
<b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b>				
To fund Upper Tichbourne Street Hostel from Homelessness Grant (currently funded by former Supporting People, but a proposed reduction in that budget see SPR8)				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Other				
<b><u>Service implications</u></b>				
The proposal will allow the homelessness services a safety net during a time of uncertainty about the future levels of single homelessness in the city . The Single Access Point and Pathway Planning in hostels will still be implemented to achieve more effective and efficient use of hostel bedspaces across the council and voluntary sector. Work will continue to develop better alternatives to catered hostels, and the Revolving Door Project will aim to reduce the number of repeat hostel users.				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
<b>Date:</b>				
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs				
Income				
<b>Net Total SP grant aid</b>	332	332	332	332
<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>		<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	Retain 20			
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2010-11**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Single homelessness		<b>Proposal No:</b> HGF G4			
<b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b>					
To use funds from the Homelessness Grant to support the new (in house) Revolving Door Service which seeks to reduce the number of single homeless people who have repeat stays in the council and voluntary sector hostels, as part of the changes to reduce overall hostel use by single people.					
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Service Improvement					
<b><u>Service implications</u></b>					
Individuals who have stayed in hostels more than once before during the past 2 years will be assigned to the service, with the aim of supporting them into accommodation that they will sustain, and not return to rough sleeping or the hostels. In the last six months 121 such individuals have been identified, 60% have stayed in hostels 2 to 5 times and 42% between 6 and 11 times. This represents between 30% and 45% of hostel admissions each month. A new approach is needed.					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
Date: 1/4/2011					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>			
Staff		85.0	85.0	85.0	
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
<b>Net Total</b>	Nil	85.0	85.0	85.0	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	2	3	3	3	
Extra post(s) (FTE)					

**HOUSING STRATEGY & OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	<b>Proposal No: G5</b>			
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b></p> <p>Homelessness Grant Additional Resource.          Additional General Fund money required to fund a shortfall in the homelessness grant.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				<b>Date:</b>
				1 4 11
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs		73	73	73
Income				
<b>Net Total</b>		73	73	73
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	<b>Hostels</b>	<b>Proposal No: G6</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b>					
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>The Supporting People budget proposals include the closure of Lower Hastings Street hostel which results in a loss of net income of £70.2k.</p>					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Other					
<b><u>Service Implications</u></b>					
n/a					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
Date: 1/4/2011					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
		<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b><u>Effects of Changes on budget</u></b>					
		<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income            loss of net income				70.2	70.2
<b>Net Total</b>					
<b>Staffing Implications</b> none			<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					



**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA Private Sector Decent Homes</b>		<b>Proposal No: R2</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b>					
To support low income owner occupiers to improve their homes in support of independent living					
<b><u>Proposal</u></b>					
12 -18 month contribution from general fund to premises costs to make up for reduction in capitilisation, awaiting finding smaller premises for reduced teams. .					
<b><u>Service Implications</u></b>					
None					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
Date: 1/4/2011					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
		<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs	125	16.8	16.8		
Income					
<b>Net Total</b>		16.8	16.8		
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA Empty Homes ( private sector)</b>		<b>Proposal No: HGF R3</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> To reduce the number of long standing private sector empty homes in Leicester.					
<b><u>Details</u></b>  The Government has announced an Empty Homes Bonus for net reductions in homes <i>empty for over 6 months</i> . The bonus is the national council tax equivalent, paid for 6 years. ( est. 1k+ per property pa) Based on performance in 2009/10 this is expected to provide additional payment of £455k in 2011/12, ongoing for 6 years. Any empty homes brought back into use in subsequent years will increase this payment. The Empty Homes Team will continue to contact and advise owners of any home which is empty for more than 18 months and focus intensive work on the current 645 private homes that have been empty for over 5 years. In 2009/10 the team were involved in bringing a gross 320, net 180, long standing empty homes back into use.					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b> Increase income by £50k contribution from Empty Homes Bonus from 2012/13 onwards. The ongoing employment of two staff will be dependent on sufficient bonus being earned to pay for their salaries and costs.					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b> Maintain existing service					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b> <p align="right"><b>Date: 1/4/2011</b></p>					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff	112				
Non Staff Costs	132.6				
Income			(50)	(50)	
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>244.6</b>		<b>(50)</b>	<b>(50)</b>	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	5	5	5	5	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA Housing Development</b>		<b>Proposal No: R4</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> To enable the development of new affordable housing in Leicester by working with the Homes and Community Agency, Housing Associations , private developers and other stakeholders to maximise investment in the city.					
<b><u>Details</u></b> Reduction in Housing Development staffing. Government has announced a major reduction in national total funds for affordable housing and a new system for affordable housing grants. It is not yet clear how the new system will work locally.					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>  Service Reduction					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b> The reduction in the supply of new affordable homes will be felt in 2012/13 onwards , when the current pipeline schemes are completed. The reduction in staff reflects the predicted reduction in opportunities for developing new schemes.					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>  Date: 1/4/2011					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff	316	(105)	(105)	(105)	
Non Staff Costs	.8				
Income	nil				
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>316.9</b>	<b>(105)</b>	<b>(105)</b>	<b>(105)</b>	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	9				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		3	3	3	
Current vacancies (FTE)		2.5	2.5	2.5	
Individuals at risk (FTE)		.5	.5	.5	

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA Housing Options</b>		<b>Proposal No: R5</b>				
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> Housing Options is a statutory service offering Housing Advice to all citizens, preventing homelessness, dealing with homelessness, maintaining Housing Register and responsible for Housing allocation Policy.						
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>  Efficiency savings arising from introduction of Leicester HomeChoice and promotion of web based services, including on line housing registration and telephone advice. Less use of bed and breakfast, savings in printing and interpretation costs and ongoing underspend on staffing budget. </td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Efficiency savings arising from introduction of Leicester HomeChoice and promotion of web based services, including on line housing registration and telephone advice. Less use of bed and breakfast, savings in printing and interpretation costs and ongoing underspend on staffing budget.	
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Efficiency savings arising from introduction of Leicester HomeChoice and promotion of web based services, including on line housing registration and telephone advice. Less use of bed and breakfast, savings in printing and interpretation costs and ongoing underspend on staffing budget.						
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>						
Efficiency						
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b><u>Financial Implications (including investment on One-Point-Call) &amp; link to SLEP (communities)</u></b> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Financial Implications (including investment on One-Point-Call) &amp; link to SLEP (communities)</u></b>	
<b><u>Financial Implications (including investment on One-Point-Call) &amp; link to SLEP (communities)</u></b>						
<b><u>Earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>						
Date: 1/04/2011						
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>	
		<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>						
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>				
Staff						
Non Staff Costs		(173.8)	(173.8)	(173.8)		
Income						
<b>Net Total</b>	1396.9	(173.8)	(173.8)	(173.8)		
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>		
Current service staffing (FTE)	44					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	0	0	0	0		
Current vacancies (FTE)	1					
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0					

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Rough Sleepers Outreach Team		<b>Proposal No: R7</b>															
<b>Purpose of Service</b> The team contacts rough sleepers and potential rough sleepers to encourage engagement with housing and other services. The team runs the reconnection service for single homeless coming from out of Leicester ,supports the street drinking project and the Revolving Door service.																	
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="6"><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6">Reduce permanent team from 4 FTE to 3</td> </tr> </table>						<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>						Reduce permanent team from 4 FTE to 3					
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>																	
Reduce permanent team from 4 FTE to 3																	
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>																	
Efficiency																	
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>																	
Street work requires visits in pairs. The team reduction may reduce the numbers of days per week that walkabouts can be done in some weeks, but the reduced level of staffing will be sufficient to maintain the overall service. The new Revolving Door Service will provide more focused and continuous work with rough sleepers – once they come into the hostels.																	
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>																	
Date: 1/4/2011																	
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>												
		<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>												
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>																	
		<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>														
Staff	GF	102.4	(25)	(25)	(25)												
Non Staff Costs	GF	12.2	(5)	(5)	(5)												
Income																	
<b>Net Total</b>		114.6	(30.0)	(30.0)	(30.0)												
<b>Staffing Implications</b>			<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>												
Current service staffing (FTE)			5	5	5												
Post(s) deleted (FTE)			2	2	2												
Current vacancies (FTE) ( one temp)			2	2	2												
Individuals at risk (FTE)			0	0	0												

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Y Advice and Support Centre		<b>Proposal No:</b> R8			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> Day Centre to support homeless vulnerably housed and rough sleepers					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>            To reduce the grant funding to the Y Advice and Support Centre by £26.4 k (15% of current grant)         </td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> To reduce the grant funding to the Y Advice and Support Centre by £26.4 k (15% of current grant)
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> To reduce the grant funding to the Y Advice and Support Centre by £26.4 k (15% of current grant)					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b> Efficiency					
<b><u>Service Implications</u></b> The YMCA run a day centre within the Dawn Centre which provides advice , support, clothing, breakfasts ,lunches and learning opportunities to hostels dwellers, street homeless and the vulnerably housed. It provides hard to reach clients with encouragement to take up medical ,educational and employment services, including the Homeless Health Care Project (now Inclusion Health Care Social Enterprise), Housing Options and employment and skill improvement schemes.  The project will need to identify, in conjunction with council staff, how best to achieve the saving while continuing most of its current service level.					
<b><u>Earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b> <p align="right"><b>Date:</b> 1/04/2011</p>					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
		<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
<b>Net Total grant aid</b>		175.6	(26.4)	(26.4)	(26.4)
<b>Staffing Implications</b>			<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Homeless Health Project/Inclusion Health Care	<b>Proposal No:R9</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> To provide NHS services to hostel dwellers, rough sleepers and the vulnerably housed					
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction</u></b> To end 3 small grants that are due to end in March 2011 : £8.1k for administrative support/annual report of homeless multi-disciplinary team £6.5k for alternative therapy for patients £7.7k for footcare for patients					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>  Service Reduction					
<b><u>Service Implications</u></b> Potential reduction in healthcare available. The Homeless Health project is now a social enterprise. ( Inclusion Healthcare Social Enterprise CIC Ltd)					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>  <p align="right"><b>Date: 1/4/2011</b></p>					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
		<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
<b>Net Total grant</b>		22.3	(22.3)	(22.3)	(22.3)
<b>Staffing Implications</b>			<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

**HOUSING STRATEGY AND OPTIONS DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA : Family Support and Corner Club</b>		<b>Proposal No: R10</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> The Family Support Service provides additional family support to families in Border House and parents living in other hostels. Corner Club provide part time day care for children living at Border House homeless hostel, and study support for school age children.					
<b><u>Details of proposed reduction</u></b>  To reduce the number of children that can be offered day care at Border House, by reducing capacity from 9 to 6 children per session and rationalising the management of Family Support and Corner Club services (£62.6k). This is an in-house service formerly funded by the Homelessness Grant.					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>  Efficiency and Service Reduction					
<b><u>Service Implications</u></b> The number of families and children staying at Border House and its outlying accommodation has reduced. Family Support and the Corner Club and Study Support will continue to provide additional support to children and parents while they are in the hostel.					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>  <p align="right"><b>Date: 1/4/2011</b></p>					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
<b>Net Total</b> from Homelessness grant	62.6	(62.6)	(62.6)	(62.6)	(62.6)
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	10				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	4				
Current vacancies (FTE)	3				
Individuals at risk (FTE)	1				



## Budget Equality Impact Assessment R4 Housing Development Services

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p><b>The EIA (2008) into Leicester's draft Affordable Housing Strategy found that the main equality issues arise out of ensuring the best mix of types and sizes of affordable accommodation in the right locations. It found that some types of housing are more difficult to achieve than others, such as large family homes and wheelchair housing. This has a disproportionately greater impact on some groups, e.g, BME groups, physically disabled people and larger families.</b></p> <p><b>It is the Housing Devt Team who:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure sites are assessed to establish a mix to best meet the city's current &amp; future affordable housing needs;</li> <li>• lead on negotiations with developers and funders to seek to secure best mix at the right standards (including S106 negotiations);</li> <li>• work to establish and/or confirm the standards that will best meet different groups' needs (eg LCC's Wheelchair Accessible brief, LCC's minimum space standards);</li> <li>• monitor &amp; progress-chase all pipeline new supply of affordable housing to ensure that they are fit for purpose &amp; can be promptly occupied;</li> <li>• seek to ensure that there is a rolling programme of sites and opportunities for future supply.</li> </ul> <p><b>The Government's cuts to funding available for affordable housing via the Homes &amp; Communities Agency, together with wider budget reductions (which will make seeking public subsidy from other sources – eg LA own funds - harder to secure) will significantly reduce the number of new affordable homes that can be secured in the city in the next few years. Reductions in the team are proposed at a level that reflects the current opportunities for new schemes in the city.</b></p>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of

	<p>the particular area?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b></p> <p>The reduced supply of new affordable homes in future years resulting from cuts to HCA funding will mean fewer areas of the city will see new provision. It is not yet clear whether this, in itself, will have any equality impact.</p>
<b>Gender equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b></p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>As per submission on race</p>
<b>Disability equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>As per submission on race</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>Allocation of social housing has caused community divisions in other parts of the UK.</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment – R5 Housing Options Service

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> Answer: NO IMPACT/RISK
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> Answer: NO IMPACT/RISK
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> Answer: NO IMPACT/RISK
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> Answer: NO IMPACT/RISK
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> Answer: NO IMPACT/RISK

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment  
R7 Rough Sleepers Outreach Team**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: The majority of service users are white</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  <b>Quick response from other services in dealing with the street homeless population , to ensure the Rough Sleepers Outreach Team’s time is spent more effectively on the street rather than accompanying clients to Services . Revolving door service to prevent re-occurrence of repeat homelessness and rough sleeping</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: Impacts equally across all areas of the city however recent research suggest that most single homeless groups originate from the west side of the city and a small number from out of Leicester.</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: Yes as the street homeless population is disproportionately males ( approximately 95 %)</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  <b>As per above</b>
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk  No there would be no disproportionate effect</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>

<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>  <b>A reduction in staff support levels could impact on vulnerable street homeless with the possibility of an increase in crime disorder , drug and alcohol issues, begging , and an increase in accident and emergency admissions due to deterioration of health and well being. The average length of stay of rough sleepers may increase.</b>  <b>However it is believed that the introduction of the Revolving door project and other measures to support this client group , including close cooperation with other partners and agencies will mitigate this impact.</b>

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment  
R8 YASC Grant Reduction**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  Statistics show that this service is predominantly used by white people, although just over a quarter of the users are from a Black Minority Ethnic community.  However, we do not envisage a reduction in provision would adversely affect one group over another.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  N/A
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  N/A
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  It is more likely to affect men, who are the predominant users of this service.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	Work with the provider to ensure there is no adverse effect
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>

	A number of users of this service are likely to be disabled
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>We would need to work with the provider to ensure that there is no adverse effect.</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is not anticipated that the efficiency required will impact upon community cohesion.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>N/A</p>

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment**  
**R9 Grant to Homeless HealthCare/Inclusion HealthCare**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> The majority of service users (68%) are white
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> The Homeless HealthCare project has become a social enterprise and is looking for ways to improve services to its patients. They provide access to NHS care which this client group may otherwise not access. These particular services may have to cease.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> Impacts equally across all areas of the city however recent research suggest that most single homeless groups originate from the west side of the city and a small number from out of Leicester.
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> Patients are predominantly male (86%)
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> Depends on capacity of the new of social enterprise and level of care available through NHS
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>  Many of the patients have long term illnesses
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  As above

<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> <b>Not directly.</b>

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment  
R10 Border House Family Support Service and Corner Club Staff**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: 65% of service users are white</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  <b>The eligibility criteria and thresholds to access for the Family Support Service and Corner Club services will need to be reviewed to ensure that priority is given to vulnerable groups , specifically those that are involved with Children’s and Young Persons Services</b>  <b>The Family Support Services and Corner Club activities will no longer be available to the voluntary sector providers of homeless services. Recent demand from the voluntary sector has decreased.</b>  <b>All children currently eligible for corner club services may have their time allowed reduced on a rotating basis</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: No as service is demand driven irrespective of ethnic origin</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: Yes as overall two thirds of Family Support Service clients are females. However the family composition is indeterminable ( Children) prior to admission and is demand led irrespective of gender</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  <b>As per submission above</b>
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk No because it is not disproportionate to any group and is</b>

	<p><b>demand led</b></p> <p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p><b>There would be no disproportionate impact compared with other groups as any reduction in service delivery will effect all groups similarly</b></p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p><b>Yes could result in issues within the premises or vicinity because of reduction in allocated time to meaningful activities for children with the aim of diverting their attentions from ASB and other destructed behaviours.</b></p> <p><b>There is a possibility that in appropriate behaviour could both increase the risk of eviction from the hostel and also child protection issues. Previously a full service had in fact contributed to the deregistration of children's protection plans</b></p>

**Budget Equality Impact Assessment  
Efficiency Saving Proposals  
R11 Grant to TRAM**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  Statistics show that this service is predominantly used by white people
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  Work with the provider to divert clients to other alternative employment projects
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  N/A
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  Yes it is more likely to affect men rather than women
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	Work with the provider to divert clients to other alternative employment projects
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>  No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  N/A

<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>  It is not anticipated that the efficiency required will impact upon community cohesion.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  N/A