

## **Planning and Economic Development Budget Summary 2011/12**

### **Summary**

- 1.1 The division has a small budget increase excluding grant transfers (which have no net impact) of £14k in 2011/12 followed by a budget reduction of £0.43m from 2012/13 onwards.
- 1.2 The net growth is composed of budget pressures of £269k in 2011/12 onwards and proposed savings of £255k in 2011/12 rising to £699k by 2013/14. The budget pressures relate to the cutting of the Housing Planning and Delivery Grant and projected shortfalls in the Markets budget. The savings are mainly from a reduction in management and other specialist staffing in the Planning Service and a reduction in funding for sub-regional economic development including the successor body of Prospect Leicester and Leicestershire Promotions. An increase in income from the Leicester Business Centre is also identified.

### **Background**

- 1.3 The budget proposals have been made in the context of the 30% reduction in revenue support grant over a 4 year period, cessation of the Housing Planning Delivery Grant and a significant reduction in economic regeneration funding, particularly at the sub regional level.
- 1.4 The Division's 2010/11 net revenue budget is £2.6m (£1.7m for Planning, £0.9m for Economic Development, £0.6m for Performance, Equality and Admin, a net income budget of £0.7m for Markets and £0.1m for the general divisional budget
- 1.5 Savings of £255k in 2011/12 (excluding severance costs which are funded centrally) rising to £699k by 2013/14 are proposed. This equates to a saving of 10% in 2011/12 (rising to 27% by 2013/14) of the £2.6m 2010/11 budget.
- 1.6 There are additional budget pressures for 2011/12 onwards of £269k. £182k of this relates to the cessation of the Housing Planning and Delivery Grant following the change of government. This was used to fund establishment posts in the planning service. The remaining £87k budget pressure relates to a projected shortfall in the Markets' net income budget. This is a legacy of unavoidable cost increases and the commercial reality of not being able to increase rental income in line with standard annual inflation rates.
- 1.7 The Economic Assessment duty grant transfer has no net impact on the Division's budget.

## **Rational for savings proposals**

- 1.8 Proposals in the Planning Service recognise the priority to maintain frontline service delivery to ensure regeneration, housing development and employment/business growth are supported in the City. Proposals include a reduction of 10 posts of which 4 are vacant posts. A review of the service will restructure the management team resulting in a loss of 1 Head of Service and 3 Team Leaders. Other savings are focused on reduction of some specialist posts and this will be mitigated by up skilling generic planning officer posts. A small reduction of running costs is proposed.
- 1.9 Proposals in the Economic Regeneration Team recognise the priority to supporting business growth and create private sector investment/jobs. Reductions in sub regional grants from external agencies are reflected in the proposals to reduce grants to Prospect Leicestershire, Leicestershire Promotions and the sub regional unit by 30%. The loss of one sub regional support post is expected as a result of the reduction in City Council contributions. A transitional sum is allowed for in 2011/12 to manage the costs of merging PL/LPL into one body in order to deliver the resulting efficiencies. An increase in income is allowed for at Leicester Business Centre following completion of refurbishment/expansion. A small reduction is proposed in the Overseas Links budget.
- 1.10 A modest reduction in the Divisional training budget is proposed.

## **Risk Assessment**

- 1.11 Planning: The loss of management and specialist staffing capacity will be managed through a service review process to minimise impact. This will include refocusing management to key priorities and increasing the skills of general planning staff in specialist work areas.
- 1.12 Economic Regeneration: Proposed savings in economic development contributions for sub regional bodies reflects the major reductions in grant funded programmes and reductions in contributions made by sub regional partners. Delays in the Leicester Business Centre improvement scheme could prevent increase in income but prudent assumptions have been made for additional income for 2011/12. Modest reduction of Overseas Links budget will not affect twinning arrangements significantly.

## **Equality Impact Assessment**

- 1.13 Impact assessments show that the proposed budget cuts are not anticipated to have any adverse impact on any specific staffing groups or in terms of service delivery impacting on any specific groups within the local community.

## Planning & Economic Development (Councillor Osman)

		<u>2011/12</u> £000	<u>2012/13</u> £000	<u>2013/14</u> £000
	Economic Assessment Duty Grant Transfer from ABG	63	63	63
	<b>Budget Pressures:</b>			
PED1	Housing Planning Delivery Grant	182	182	182
PED2	Markets shortfall	87	87	87
	<b>Proposed Savings:</b>			
	<b>Planning Management</b>			
PED3	Management review – Heads of Service/Team Leaders	(202)	(202)	(202)
	<b>Planning Policy &amp; Design</b>			
PED4	Reduction in specialist staffing (conversation & design)	(129)	(163)	(163)
	Reduction in running costs	(15)	(15)	(15)
	Sub total	(144)	(178)	(178)
	<b>Planning Management &amp; Delivery</b>			
PED5	Staff reduction – planning	(15)	(15)	(15)
	<b>Economic Regeneration</b>			
PED6	Reduction in contribution towards sub regional support unit	(24)	(24)	(24)
	Reduction in Prospect Leicestershire grant	(75)	(75)	(75)
	Reduction in Leicestershire Promotions grant	(107)	(107)	(107)
	Economic delivery review - transition costs	120		
	Reduction in overseas links	(12)	(12)	(12)
	Sub total	(98)	(218)	(218)
PED7	Increased income at Leicester Business Centre	(40)	(80)	(80)
	<b>Divisional Management</b>			
PED8	Reduce divisional training	(6)	(6)	(6)
	Staff costs incurred during review and notice period	250		
	<b>Net Growth / (Reduction)</b>	77 ===	(367) =====	(367) =====

**PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Planning		<b>Proposal No:</b> PED1		
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b></p> <p>Increase in base budget to meet the loss of Housing Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG).</p>				
<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>				
<p>The 2010/11 budget assumed that £182.6k in HPDG would be receivable in respect of 5 posts within the Planning service. However, following the change of Government, HPDG was terminated w.e.f. 1 April 2010. The 2010/11 costs were met by the unspent 2009/10 HPDG.</p> <p>Savings identified in PEDs 3,4 and 5 include proposed savings from staff reductions to offset the loss of HPDG.</p>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				<b>Date:</b> 1 April 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 Addition</b>		
Staff	182.6	182.6	182.6	182.6
Non Staff Costs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Income	(182.6)	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Net Total</b>	0.0	182.6	182.6	182.6
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE) - See PED 3,4 and 5		0	0	0
Extra post(s) (FTE)		0	0	0

## Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Name of Service Area</b>	<b>Planning and Economic Development Division</b>
<b>Head of Service undertaking EIA</b>	<b>Andrew Smith</b>
<b>Proposal PED1</b>	<b>Increase in base budget to meet the loss of Housing Planning Delivery Grant</b>

overall impact	
<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.
	Risks not considered to be significant and will be considered as part of Planning Service review See PED 3,4 and 5
	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? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Risks not considered to be significant and will be considered as part of Planning Service review See PED 3,4 and 5
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	Risks not considered to be significant and will be considered as part of Planning Service review See PED 3,4 and 5
<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) and not by non-disabled people?
	Risks not considered to be significant and will be considered as part of Planning Service review See PED 3,4 and 5
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	Risks not considered to be significant and will be considered as part of Planning Service review See PED 3,4 and 5

**PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Markets		<b>Proposal No: PED2</b>		
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b></p> <p>Increase in base budget to meet the running costs of the Markets and unachievable inflation on current income target.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Other				
<b><u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP</u></b>				
<p>Despite the implementation of a detailed action plan to reduce expenditure and increase income, the surplus target cannot be met in 2010/11. A balanced budget has been determined for 11/12 onwards which requires a budget increase of £87k</p>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				<b>Date:</b> 1 April 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 Addition</b>		
Staff	409.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non Staff Costs	759.5	60.0	60.0	60.0
Income	(1,901.3)	27.0	27.0	27.0
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>(732.5)</b>	<b>87.0</b>	<b>87.0</b>	<b>87.0</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)		N/a	N/a	N/a

## Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Name of Service Area</b>	<b>Planning and Economic Development Division</b>
<b>Head of Service undertaking EIA</b>	<b>Andrew Smith</b>
<b>Proposal PED2</b>	<b>Increase in base budget to meet the increased running costs of the Markets and unachievable inflation on income target.</b>

<b>overall impact</b>	
<b>Race equality</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Risks not considered to be significant</p> <p>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? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.</p> <p>Risks not considered to be significant</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?</p> <p>Risks not considered to be significant</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) and not by non-disabled people?</p> <p>Risks not considered to be significant</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?</p> <p>Risks not considered to be significant</p>

**PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> – Planning		<b>Proposal No: PED3</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> To manage the Planning service					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>            Planning management review to rationalise Heads of Service (reduce from 2 to 1) and Team Leaders (reduce from 9 to 6)         </td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Planning management review to rationalise Heads of Service (reduce from 2 to 1) and Team Leaders (reduce from 9 to 6)
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Planning management review to rationalise Heads of Service (reduce from 2 to 1) and Team Leaders (reduce from 9 to 6)					
<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>  <p>Proposal reflects contraction of service to meet budget requirements and consolidation of activity into new teams. Also loss of regional planning. Aim to minimise impact on frontline service delivery through service review.</p> <p>Potential impact on One Leicester/SIEP priorities for regeneration and housing growth. Significant reduction in management capacity placing greater demands on managers &amp; other staff. Impact on capacity to respond to any regeneration up turn in the City.</p>					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b> Date: 1 October 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	202.0	202.0	202.0	202.0	202.0
Non Staff Costs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Income	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>202.0</b>	<b>202.0</b>	<b>202.0</b>	<b>202.0</b>	<b>202.0</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		11	0	0	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		4	0	0	
Current vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)		4	0	0	



## Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Name of Service Area</b>	<b>Planning and Economic Development Division</b>
<b>Head of Service undertaking EIA</b>	<b>Andrew Smith</b>
<b>Proposal PED3</b>	<p>Reduction in budgets within the division by 4 posts. 1 Head of Service and 3 Team Leaders in Planning Services.</p> <p>Saving of £202,000 to be made. Effective from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011.</p>

<b>overall impact</b>	All customers are affected. Reduction in management positions in the service could lead to a reduced service for all. 13 members of staff will be included in the review as it relates to HOS/Team leaders.
<b>Race equality</b>	<p>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.</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No adverse impact anticipated. Will be determined as part of the review process</p> <p>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? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No significant adverse impact anticipated Staff – No BME HOS - No impact Out of 11 Team Leaders 4 are BME To be determined by the review</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?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No specific adverse impact anticipated. <b>Staff</b> - Will be determined as part of the review HOS -1 male and female Team -Leaders 6 male and 5 female</p>

<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) and not by non-disabled people?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No specific adverse impact anticipated. HOS - 1 disabled employee Team Leader – none
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No significant adverse impact anticipated.

If you have identified any potential negative impacts above, please provide more detail about who will be affected, how they will be affected and what can be done to reduce or remove any negative impacts.

**Q1. Who will be negatively affected? Please describe the particular group, giving potential numbers of those affected if possible.**

**Current compliment of managers**

- 2 Heads of Service (1 male, 1 female and 1 disabled )
- 11 Team Leaders (6 male, 5 female) (4 BME of which 2 Men , 2 Woman).

Potential impact on all managers in the service area

**Q2. Describe the type of negative impact from the perspective of our equality duties:**

- Is this as a result of discrimination – where one group of residents is being deliberately or accidentally treated differently from another group?
- Is this as a result of reducing/removing equal opportunity of access to our services/the benefits received from taking up our services for some groups compared to others?
- Is this as a result of likelihood to contribute to poor relations between different groups within/across the city (for example, if they perceive unfair treatment because of what they see/think other groups in the city are receiving)?

**Q3. What can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact you have identified?**

Significant reduction in management capacity, could impact on service delivery to customers, placing more pressure on managers and operational

staff to respond to demand. Also direct services such as planning, design and conservation advice could impact on BME applicants as there has historically been a higher refusal rate for BME applicants.

- Reduced through expressions of voluntary redundancy and retirement.
- Redeployment
- More targeted and focussed sessions, in particular wards.
- More work with ward councillors and attending ward meetings.
- Improved planning website
- More accessible online advice.
- Continued monitoring at Planning Committee

**PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA – Planning Policy &amp; Design</b>		<b>Proposal No: PED4</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> To manage the Planning & Policy service					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>  Reduction in specialist staffing (conservation &amp; design) and related running costs </td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Reduction in specialist staffing (conservation & design) and related running costs
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Reduction in specialist staffing (conservation & design) and related running costs					
<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> <p>3 of the 5.5 posts identified supporting conservation and design are currently vacant. The proposal to reduce team leaders across the Planning Service will require some redesign of teams and this will impact on the current Conservation and Urban Design teams. Service review will prioritise resources to support frontline determination of planning applications to support and encourage growth and investment in the short term. Use retained specialists to up skill frontline Planning Management and Delivery staff on conservation and design to ensure sound decision making.</p> <p>The impact of a reduction in this specialist capacity will potentially have an impact on the planning support for conservation and quality design but this will be offset by up skilling generalist planners in other areas. Main impact is likely to be the need to re-prioritise policy activity in relation to these specialist areas and in some cases delay policy preparation.</p> <p>Reduction in running costs will impact on policy preparation in the current Planning Policy and Design teams and will require re-prioritisation of activity.</p>					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b> Date: 1 October 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	555.0	129.0	163.0	163.0	
Non Staff Costs	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	
Income	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>570.0</b>	<b>144.0</b>	<b>178.0</b>	<b>178.0</b>	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		14.5	10	0	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		4.5	1	0	
Current vacancies (FTE)		3	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)	12	2	1	0	

## Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Name of Service Area</b>	Planning Policy and Design
<b>Head of Service undertaking EIA</b>	Diana Chapman
<b>Proposal PED4</b>	Effective from 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2011.  Budget reductions of £163,000. Amounting to reduction of 5 ½ posts

<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.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> Less staff and reduced service. No positive impact for customers.
	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? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No significant impact anticipated.
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	All customers that receive urban design and conservation service. No particular group affected. <b>Staff</b> - No anticipated adverse impact on male to female ratio.
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) and not by non-disabled people?</b>
	Your assessment of impact/risk No adverse impact anticipated

<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No specific adverse impact is anticipated

If you have identified any potential negative impacts above, please provide more detail about who will be affected, how they will be affected and what can be done to reduce or remove any negative impacts.

**Q1. Who will be negatively affected? Please describe the particular group, giving potential numbers of those affected if possible.**

**Service**

No specific adverse impact is anticipated

**Staff**

5 ½ posts affected

Deletion of 3 vacant posts therefore no impact.

No impact on male to female ratio. No affect on BME.

Overall Outcome not known. To be determined as part of the review.

**Q2. Describe the type of negative impact from the perspective of our equality duties:**

- Is this as a result of discrimination – where one group of residents is being deliberately or accidentally treated differently from another group?
- Is this as a result of reducing/removing equal opportunity of access to our services/the benefits received from taking up our services for some groups compared to others?
- Is this as a result of likelihood to contribute to poor relations between different groups within/across the city (for example, if they perceive unfair treatment because of what they see/think other groups in the city are receiving)?

**Q3. What can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact you have identified?**

Service Impacts reduced through:

- Concentration of resources available for advice on BME applicants or areas with concentration of BME
- Focus on awareness raising in relevant wards

- Work with ward councillors at ward meetings
- Improve planning website, more accessible online advice
- Continued monitoring at Planning Committee

Staff Impacts reduced through:

- Staff impacts: deletion of 3 vacant posts, therefore no impact on staff for those 3 posts.
- Potential for voluntary redundancy and retirement.





## Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Name of Service Area</b>	<b>Planning Management and Delivery</b>
<b>Head of Service undertaking EIA</b>	<b>Mike Richardson</b>
<b>Proposal PED5</b>	<b>Budget reduction of £15,000. Amounting to staff reduction and deletion of 0.5 post</b>

<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.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> Less staff and reduced service. No positive impact for customers. Less planning advice could impact on BME as there is a higher refusal rate for BME applicants. <b>Staff impact</b> - No significant impact anticipated given the level of saving required.
	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? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> Less staff and reduced service. No positive impact for customers. Less planning advice could impact on BME as there is a higher refusal rate for BME applicants. No significant adverse impact anticipated.
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No specific adverse impact anticipated
<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) and not by non-disabled people?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No specific adverse impacted anticipated.
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No specific adverse impact is anticipated.

If you have identified any potential negative impacts above, please provide more detail about who will be affected, how they will be affected and what can be done to reduce or remove any negative impacts.

**Q1. Who will be negatively affected? Please describe the particular group, giving potential numbers of those affected if possible.**

- No significant impact anticipated given the level of saving required

**Q2. Describe the type of negative impact from the perspective of our equality duties:**

- Is this as a result of discrimination – where one group of residents is being deliberately or accidentally treated differently from another group?
- Is this as a result of reducing/removing equal opportunity of access to our services/the benefits received from taking up our services for some groups compared to others?
- Is this as a result of likelihood to contribute to poor relations between different groups within/across the city (for example, if they perceive unfair treatment because of what they see/think other groups in the city are receiving)?

N/A

**Q3. What can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact you have identified?**

- N/A

**Staff impact (reduction of 0.5 post) through**

- No significant impact anticipated given the level of saving required.

**PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> – Economic Regeneration		<b>Proposal No: PED6</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> To provide an Economic Development Service					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>            Reduction in contribution towards sub regional support unit, reduction in Prospect Leicestershire and Leicestershire Promotions grants and reduction in overseas links services.         </td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Reduction in contribution towards sub regional support unit, reduction in Prospect Leicestershire and Leicestershire Promotions grants and reduction in overseas links services.
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Reduction in contribution towards sub regional support unit, reduction in Prospect Leicestershire and Leicestershire Promotions grants and reduction in overseas links services.					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b> Service Reductions					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b> Reduction of support for Sub Regional Support unit and Prospect Leicestershire set at 30% in line with other service area reductions and also reductions proposed by County and District partners  The new Local Enterprise Partnership will need to re-focus activity away from major grant funded programmes towards enabling and coordinating economic activity. The service area will need to be reviewed during 2011/12 to take account of the reduced contributions from partners.  The proposed combination of Prospect Leicestershire and Leicestershire Promotions into one body reflects the reduction in grant funded regeneration activity and provides the opportunity for efficiency savings.  Overseas Links grant reductions will require a re prioritisation of resources to projects but unlikely to have significant impact at levels proposed.					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b> Date: 1 April 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	80.0	24.0	24.0	24.0	
Non Staff Costs	303.0	74.0	194.0	194.0	
Income	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>383.0</b>	<b>109.0</b>	<b>229.0</b>	<b>229.0</b>	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (Sub regional Support Unit (FTE))		6	0	0	
Post(s) deleted as result of LCC reductions (FTE)		1	0	0	
Current vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0	
Individuals at risk as result of LCC reductions (FTE)		1	0	0	

## Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Name of Service Area</b>	<b>Economic Regeneration Group</b>
<b>Head of Service undertaking EIA</b>	<b>Mike Dalzell</b>
<b>Proposal PED6</b>	<p>Effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011.</p> <p><b>1) Reduction in grants/budget to (details below)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prospect Leicester - reduction of 30% equating to £75,000 reduction</li> <li>• LPL reduction of 30% equating to £107,000 for 11/12 to 13/14. £120,000 transitional costs included for 11/12</li> <li>• Sub regional support unit - reduction of 30% equating to £24,000 reduction</li> <li>• Overseas Links (£12,000 )</li> </ul> <p><b>2) Cut to Sub regional support unit (likely equivalent to 1 post)</b></p>

<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.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>
	No significant adverse impact on any specific group.
	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? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
<b>Race equality</b>	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>
	No specific adverse impact is anticipated
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>
	No specific adverse impact anticipated

<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) and not by non-disabled people?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No specific adverse impact is anticipated
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No specific adverse impact is anticipated

If you have identified any potential negative impacts above, please provide more detail about who will be affected, how they will be affected and what can be done to reduce or remove any negative impacts.

**Q1. Who will be negatively affected? Please describe the particular group, giving potential numbers of those affected if possible.**

- Overseas link: No impact on Council staff
- Sub-regional support unit: equivalent to 1 post. No significant impact on any particular group.
- Prospect Leicester/LPL: No impact on Council staff

**Q2. Describe the type of negative impact from the perspective of our equality duties:**

- Is this as a result of discrimination – where one group of residents is being deliberately or accidentally treated differently from another group?
- Is this as a result of reducing/removing equal opportunity of access to our services/the benefits received from taking up our services for some groups compared to others?
- Is this as a result of likelihood to contribute to poor relations between different groups within/across the city (for example, if they perceive unfair treatment because of what they see/think other groups in the city are receiving)?

**Q3. What can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact you have identified?**

Overall there will a reduction in service, but not to any particular group.

- Prospect Leicester: Overall impact focussed on commercial property and larger business.
- Overseas Links – No particular impact on staff. No significant impact on service.
- Sub –regional unit: loss of 1 post, but no significant impact to any group of staff
- Overseas link: £12,000 reduction should not significantly affect the twinning activity
- Prospect Leicester: Potential to merge with LPL under considerations.
- Sub-regional: reducing the sub regional support unit funding (equal to 1 post): Current posts are focussed on programme management of external funding, which is being wound down. The new role is more about extending influence through dialogue and negotiation with key partners and government rather than direct commissioning.

**PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> – Economic Regeneration		<b>Proposal No:</b> PED7			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> To provide an Economic Development Service					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Increased income at Leicester Business Centre.</td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Increased income at Leicester Business Centre.
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Increased income at Leicester Business Centre.					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b> Increased income					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b> LBC is intended to operate as a stand alone business unit covering its costs from rental income payable by tenants. Increased income £80k can be achieved and progressively increased over three years through the refurbishment and extension of the premises which will be complete by end March 2011 enabling the centre to be fully marketed.					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b> Date: 1 October 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	102.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Non Staff Costs	179.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Income	(201.6)	(40.0)	(80.0)	(80.0)	
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>(40.0)</b>	<b>(80.0)</b>	<b>(80.0)</b>	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0	0	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0	0	
Current vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0	0	

## Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Name of Service Area</b>	<b>Economic Regeneration Group</b>
<b>Head of Service undertaking EIA</b>	<b>Mike Dalzell</b>
<b>Proposal PED7</b>	Increased income at Leicester Business Centre

overall impact	
<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.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</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? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</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?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> <b>Staff –</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) and not by non-disabled people?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>



**PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> – Divisional Management		<b>Proposal No: PED8</b>			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b> To manage the Planning and Economic Development service					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Reduce divisional training.</td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Reduce divisional training.
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Reduce divisional training.					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b> Service Reductions					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b> Would reduce staff opportunity to build knowledge and capacity to deliver fit for purpose and innovative service delivery. Need to find alternative low cost staff training options particularly for CPD purposes.					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b> Date: <input type="text" value="1 April 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	133.6	6.0	6.0	6.0	
Non Staff Costs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Income	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>133.6</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0	0	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0	0	
Current vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0	0	

## Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Name of Service Area</b>	<b>Planning and Economic Development Division</b>
<b>Head of Service undertaking EIA</b>	<b>Andrew Smith</b>
<b>Proposal PED8</b>	Reduce divisional training

overall impact	
<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.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</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? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</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?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>
	<b>Staff –</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) and not by non-disabled people?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b>