

Regeneration, Highways and Transport Budget Summary 2011/12

Summary

- 1.1 The division has an overall budget growth excluding grant transfers (which have no net impact) of £1.4m in 2011/12 falling to £0.2 by 2013/14. The net growth is composed of budget pressures of £3.1m in 2011/12 onwards and proposed savings of £1.7m in 2011/12 rising to £2.9m by 2013/14. The budget pressures relate mainly to concessionary fares and reduced design and supervision fees from a reduced capital programme. The savings are mainly from a reduction in headcount and a reduction in bus subsidies.

Background

- 1.2 The budget proposals have been made in the context of the 30% reduction in revenue support grant over a 4 year period, significant reductions to the local transport capital programme block funding, continued increases to the non discretionary cost of concessionary fare reimbursements and other budget pressures.
- 1.3 The division's 2010/11 net budget is £14.9m (£6.6m for Highways maintenance, £6m for concessionary fares, £0.4m for traffic and divisional management, £1.2m for planning and policy and £0.7m for the Energy and Environment teams).
- 1.4 Savings of £1.7m in 2011/12 (excluding severance costs which are funded centrally) rising to £2.87m by 2013/14 are proposed. This equates to a saving of 11% in 2011/12 (rising to 19% by 2013/14) of the £14.9m 2010/11 budget. If the non discretionary cost of concessionary fares, one off budgets and support services budgets are excluded the savings equate to a 20% reduction in 2011/12 rising to 35% by 2013/4.
- 1.5 There are new budget pressures for 2011/12 onwards of £3.1m including £1m for concessionary fare reimbursement (as fares and the number of passengers continue to increase), £1.2m for reduced capital programme design and supervision fee income (as the capital funding has reduced by 30%), £0.5m for reduced on and off street car park income (competition from cheaper car parks) and £0.4m for the Enderby Park and Ride subsidy (lower demand than anticipated).
- 1.6 All of the budget savings proposals have been used to offset these budget pressures. However this still results in an overall budget growth.
- 1.7 The grant adjustments for concessionary fares and road safety partnership have no net impact on the Division's budget.

Rational for savings proposals

- 1.8 The savings proposals of £1.7m in 2011/12 relate to reductions in staffing for capital project work (£0.8m), bus subsidies (£0.5m) and highways management costs (£0.3m).
- 1.9 The reduction in posts is 41 and the majority of this is in the design, supervision and project management teams. This reflects the 30% reduction in the DfT's block capital funding for small transport improvement schemes and the cessation of other funding such as growth point and community infrastructure. There are currently 9 vacancies and therefore the reduction in headcount is 32 with a total full year saving of £1.4m by 2012/13.
- 1.10 Given the scale of the budget pressures it is not possible for us to continue providing the existing level of supported bus services at a cost of £1m per annum. The services which are being withdrawn have been selected to minimise the adverse impact on residents.
- 1.11 The reduction in Highways management costs of £0.3m rising to £0.9m by 2013/14 is a budget reduction of 9% rising to 23% across a range of services. The cut backs are spread across a range of areas including street lighting, tree maintenance, local environment works and footway and carriageway repairs. The budget reductions are such that the division will still be able to provide a basic highway maintenance and traffic management service.
- 1.12 These budget proposals will retain sufficient staff to meet our statutory requirements (i.e. to prepare, lead, implement and monitor the Local Transport Plan – Transport Act, Highway Strategic Asset Management – Highways Act & Highway development Control) and to progress sustainable transport measures such as bus services, walking, cycling and road safety services.

Risk Assessment

- 1.13 Proposals to reduce the number of supported bus services have been compiled which seek to achieve the cost saving required whilst endeavouring to minimise the adverse impact of service withdrawals. A number of commercial routes operate in close proximity to supported bus routes.
- 1.14 The general cut over the whole highway maintenance service will maintain a basic service to keep the public highway safe. Workload reductions will affect City Highways & Parks Services, but will not affect road safety.
- 1.15 The capital highway maintenance budget is unaffected by these proposals.

Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.16 Impact assessments show that generally the budget cuts will impact on all local communities with no specific groups being disproportionately affected.
- 1.17 The reduction in supported bus services will have a greater impact on the elderly, those on lower incomes, those who do not have access to private cars, school children, and people with disabilities compared to the rest of the population. These services provide transport for people living in hard to reach areas, transport to schools, and evening services which would not otherwise be commercial and therefore not provided by a commercial operator. The dial-a-ride service is available for people who cannot access commercial routes.

Regeneration, Transport & Highways (RHT)
(Councillor Osman)

		<u>2011/12</u> £000	<u>2012/13</u> £000	<u>2013/14</u> £000
	Grant Transfers:			
	Concessionary Travel Grant Transfer	2,350	2,350	2,350
	Road Safety Partnership	100	100	100
	Budget Pressures:			
RHT 1	On street car parking income required increase	200	200	200
RHT 2	Shortfall in capital fees	1,200	1,200	1,200
RHT 3	Park & Ride Subsidy	350	350	350
RHT 4	Car Parks income & fees	331	331	331
RHT 5	Concessionary Fares	1,000	1,000	1,000
	Proposed savings:			
RHT 6	Staffing reductions – transport strategy	(60)	(60)	(60)
RHT 7	Bus subsidies reduction	(500)	(500)	(500)
RHT 8	Staffing reductions – design project management	(165)	(220)	(220)
	Traffic Management:			
RHT 9	Vacate 4 th & 5 th floor of York House	(150)	(150)	(150)
RHT 10	0.5 x parking Assistant reduction	(12)	(12)	(12)
RHT 11	Reductions in on street parking contract costs	(61)	(61)	(61)
RHT 12	Merge TRO team with another team in Traffic	(65)	(65)	(65)
RHT 13	TRO expenditure	(60)	(60)	(60)
	Startrak:			
RHT 14	4 x Project Technicians reduction	(100)	(100)	(100)
	Loss of rechargeable income	100	100	100
RHT 15	Highways Management	(342)	(597)	(912)
RHT 16	Other Divisional savings	(730)	(730)	(730)
RHT 17	Extra Income from new Pay & Display Bays	(100)	(100)	(100)
	Staff costs incurred during review and notice period	548		
	Net growth	<u>3,834</u> =====	<u>2,976</u> =====	<u>2,661</u> =====

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 1		
<p><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></p> <p>On Street Car Parking Income (ONSP) Shortfall £200k – The income from ONSP has been falling due to recession and opening up of cheap temporary car parks. The net surplus from ONSP is used to fund Concessionary fares and Bus Subsidies. This will ensure funds are available to contribute to this expenditure.</p>				
<u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u>				
Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other				
<u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>				
Funding for subsidised bus routes and concessionary fares can continue.				
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>				
Date: 01/04/2011				
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget				
	Existing Budget	Proposed Addition		
Staff	410			
Non Staff Costs	1,185			
Income	(3,800)	(200)	(200)	(200)
Net Total	(2,205)	(200)	(200)	(200)
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 1

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: DIVISIONAL		Proposal No: RHT 2		
<p><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></p> <p>Shortfall in capital fees of £1.2m - The 2011/12 Integrated Transport capital programme settlement (£2.8m) is 30% of that in 2010/11 , this combined with completion of major projects in 2010/11 will significantly reduce the fees chargeable to the capital programme.</p>				
<u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u>				
Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other				
<u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>				
Significant reduction in capital improvement schemes as a result of the reduced funding.				
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>				
Date: 01/04/2011				
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget				
	Existing Budget	Proposed Addition		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs				
Income	(2,500)	(1,200)	(1,200)	(1,200)
Net Total	(2,500)	(1,200)	(1,200)	(1,200)
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 2

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRANSPORT STRATEGY		Proposal No: RHT 3		
<p><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> Park and ride ongoing subsidy requirement £350k - The business plan for the Enderby Park and Ride service has not been met, with patronage not growing as anticipated. This additional subsidy will be used to cover all 3 Park & Ride Services, Meynell's Gorse, Enderby Park and Ride and to be opened Birstall Park & Ride.</p>				
<u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u>				
Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other				
<u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>				
This will enable the Park and Ride service to continue which will assist in reducing congestion levels within the city.				
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>				
Date: 01/04/2011				
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget				
	Existing Budget	Proposed Addition		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs	0	350	350	350
Income				
Net Total	0	350	350	350
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 3

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRANSPORT STRATEGY		Proposal No: RHT 4		
<p><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> Car Parks Income shortfall £331k – The level of car parks income has been falling due to the current economic climate and the emergence of cheap temporary car parks.</p>				
<u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u>				
Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other				
<u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>				
Provides a sustainable budget for the off street car parking service.				
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>				
Date: 01/04/2011				
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget				
	Existing Budget	Proposed Addition		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs	1,078			
Income	(2,082)	331	331	331
Net Total	(1,004)	331	331	331
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 4

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRANSPORT STRATEGY		Proposal No: RHT 5			
<p><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> Concessionary Fares £1m – This is the anticipated increased cost of funding the national concessionary fare scheme. The increase is as a result of future fare increases and a continued increase in the number of journeys.</p>					
<u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other					
<u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
This will enable the concessionary fare scheme to continue. The growth item will contribute to the “connected city” priority within “one Leicester” and will support the public transport priorities outlined in the Regeneration, Highways & Transportation service plan.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>					
Date: 01/04/2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Addition			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs	9,550	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Income	(3,521)				
Net Total	6,029	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Extra post(s) (FTE)					

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 5

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: Concessionary Travel Passes are used by all racial groups, so no specific group(s) will be specifically affected.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: Uptake of Concessionary Travel Passes is not specific to a particular area but affect all wards.
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: Concessionary Travel Passes are not primarily used by any one gender.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: The proposal will provide additional funding to enable the current Concessionary travel arrangements to be continued, in the context of the ending of specific grant funding for Concessionary Travel, and increases in the cost of providing the Concessions primarily as a result of increased usage.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: The Concessionary Travel Scheme is of particular benefit to qualifying residents who do not have access to a car, and for whom taxis would be a significant cost

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRANSPORT STRATEGY		Proposal No: RHT 6			
<u>Purpose of Service</u>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Reorganisation of the Transport strategy group, resulting in the deletion of 3 vacant posts made up of 1 team Assistant and 2 Travel Plan officers.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Reorganisation of the Transport strategy group, resulting in the deletion of 3 vacant posts made up of 1 team Assistant and 2 Travel Plan officers.</p>
<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Reorganisation of the Transport strategy group, resulting in the deletion of 3 vacant posts made up of 1 team Assistant and 2 Travel Plan officers.</p>					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
The travel planning work will be reallocated to other members within the group.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>					
Date: 01/04/2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>
		<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff	377	60	60	60	
Non Staff Costs	113				
Income	(88)				
Net Total	402	60	60	60	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		4			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		3			
Current vacancies (FTE)		3			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0			

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 6

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRANSPORT STRATEGY		Proposal No: RHT 7			
<u>Purpose of Service</u>					
<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Bus subsidies reduction - Savings of £500k p.a have been identified of which £300k p.a was savings agreed in the 2010/11 budget strategy to be implemented in 2011/12.</p>					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
Proposals have been compiled which seek to achieve the cost saving required while endeavouring to minimise the adverse impact of service withdrawals. Supported bus services provide transport for people living in hard to reach areas, transport to schools, and evening services which would not otherwise be commercial and therefore not provided by a commercial operator. Typically, elderly people, people on lower incomes, who do not have access to private to attend work or services, school children, and people with disabilities are users of supported services. The proposals include increasing fares charged on supported school bus services.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>					
Date: 01/04/2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>
		<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs	1,020	500	500	500	
Income					
Net Total	1,020	500	500	500	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 7

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: The services affected are not used by any specific racial groups, so no specific group(s) will be affected.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: The services affected are not primarily used by any one gender.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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>Your assessment of impact/risk: The reduction or withdrawal of the services concerned will affect all users, including any disabled people. Users who are affected will have the options of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Using a different transport mode to make the journey. b) Travelling at a different time when the service is available. <p>Walk and use the nearest available bus service.</p>
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Since the services are being withdrawn, the effect cannot be mitigated.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: Withdrawal of the services will cause particular difficulty to users who do not have access to a car, and for whom taxis would be a significant cost.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 7- continued

We will provide schools with information relating to nearest commercial bus services that the children could use. We will work with schools on their school travel plans to encourage more walking and cycling. We will continue to work with schools and ward community meetings to identify small highway improvements that can help make walking to school easier.

We will continue to work with bus companies to identify opportunities to help make bus services more commercial and then to extend commercial services into the areas where services are being reduced and/or stopped.

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: DESIGN & PROJECT MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 8												
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Design, contract management and project management services relating to the Transport and Regeneration projects. The section also provides Transport Fleet Management and Operational Transport Services.														
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5">Reorganisation of the Design and Project Management Group, resulting in the deletion of 6.5 posts. This reflects the greatly reduced Integrated Transport settlement for 2011/12.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>					Reorganisation of the Design and Project Management Group, resulting in the deletion of 6.5 posts. This reflects the greatly reduced Integrated Transport settlement for 2011/12.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>														
Reorganisation of the Design and Project Management Group, resulting in the deletion of 6.5 posts. This reflects the greatly reduced Integrated Transport settlement for 2011/12.														
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>														
Decisions already taken , Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other														
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>														
The reduction in establishment reflects the fall in workload, following a 30% reduction in the Integrated Transport funding for 2011/12. Reduced resources will have to be prioritised to minimise impact on the Planning for People Not Cars & Reducing our Carbon Footprint priorities. Danger of losing key staff and needing major investment to train new staff when the capital works situation improves														
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>														
Date: 01/04/2011														
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>									
Effects of Changes on budget														
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction												
Staff	1,036	165	220	220										
Non Staff Costs	104													
Income	(1,262)													
Net Total	(122)	165	220	220										
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14										
Current service staffing (FTE)		24.5												
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		6.5												
Current vacancies (FTE)		3.5												
Individuals at risk (FTE)		21.0												

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 8

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 9			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> In compliance with legislation, to manage the safe flow of traffic through and within the city, including temporary and permanent restrictions (eg roadworks and parking enforcement) and CCTV systems (including Area Traffic Control and City Centre Security).					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Not renewing the lease for floors 4 and 5 of the York House accommodation when it becomes due for renewal in March 2011. The staff in these floors will be moved to CLABS buildings in New Walk Centre and other floors at York House. </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Not renewing the lease for floors 4 and 5 of the York House accommodation when it becomes due for renewal in March 2011. The staff in these floors will be moved to CLABS buildings in New Walk Centre and other floors at York House.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Not renewing the lease for floors 4 and 5 of the York House accommodation when it becomes due for renewal in March 2011. The staff in these floors will be moved to CLABS buildings in New Walk Centre and other floors at York House.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken, Efficiency , Service Reduction, Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> No impact as staff from 4 th & 5 th will still be with the staff from Regeneration, Highways and Transportation Division. The decision to give up this accommodation flows from the reduction is divisional staffing as a result of the budget cuts especially on the Integrated Transport programme.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> <div style="text-align: right;">Date: 01/04/2011</div>					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>	
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs	530	150	150	150	
Income					
Net Total	530	150	150	150	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 9

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 10			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> In compliance with legislation, to manage the safe flow of traffic through and within the city, including temporary and permanent restrictions (eg roadworks and parking enforcement) and CCTV systems (including Area Traffic Control and City Centre Security).					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> 0.5 FTE in parking team due to permits now being more efficiently processed.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> 0.5 FTE in parking team due to permits now being more efficiently processed.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> 0.5 FTE in parking team due to permits now being more efficiently processed.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Permits now being processed in a way that requires less input from the parking team, freeing up 0.5 of a parking assistant post.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> <div style="text-align: right;">Date: 01/04/2011</div>					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>	
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff	190	12	12	12	
Non Staff Costs	220				
Income					
Net Total	410	12	12	12	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		8.5			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0.5			
Current vacancies (FTE)		0.5			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0.0			

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 10

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 11			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> In compliance with legislation, to manage the safe flow of traffic through and within the city, including temporary and permanent restrictions (eg roadworks and parking enforcement) and CCTV systems (including Area Traffic Control and City Centre Security).					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increased efficiencies by parking contractors following a fall in ticket issues.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increased efficiencies by parking contractors following a fall in ticket issues.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increased efficiencies by parking contractors following a fall in ticket issues.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> The parking enforcement contract expanded with increased issues of Penalty Charge Notices but there is now greater compliance so the size of the contracted team can be reduced.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 01/04/2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff	410				
Non Staff Costs	1,185	61	61	61	61
Income	(3,800)				
Net Total	(2,205)	61	61	61	61
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 11

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No:RHT 12			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> In compliance with legislation, to manage the safe flow of traffic through and within the city, including temporary and permanent restrictions (eg roadworks and parking enforcement) and CCTV systems (including Area Traffic Control and City Centre Security).					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Merge Parking Team and Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) team thereby deleting 1 Team leader and 1 Transport Development Officer post. </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Merge Parking Team and Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) team thereby deleting 1 Team leader and 1 Transport Development Officer post.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Merge Parking Team and Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) team thereby deleting 1 Team leader and 1 Transport Development Officer post.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
Traffic Regulation Order expenditure budget is being reduced by 66.66% (see RHT 13), meaning less work for the team. There are synergies between work of this team and the Parking team as both teams prepare Traffic Regulation Orders (temporary and permanent), merger will achieve economies of scale and enable savings in 2 posts					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>					
Date: 01/04/2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>	
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff	378	65	65	65	
Non Staff Costs	220				
Income	(5)				
Net Total	593	65	65	65	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		7			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		2			
Current vacancies (FTE)		0			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		7			

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 13

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 13												
<u>Purpose of Service</u> In compliance with legislation, to manage the safe flow of traffic through and within the city, including temporary and permanent restrictions (eg roadworks and parking enforcement) and CCTV systems (including Area Traffic Control and City Centre Security).														
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5">Reducing the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) by 66.66%.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>					Reducing the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) by 66.66%.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>														
Reducing the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) by 66.66%.														
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>														
Decisions already taken , Efficiency , Service Reduction , Other														
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>														
Over the years lot of money has been spent on TRO expenditure because of a long-established programme to introduce residents' parking schemes. The budget is now reduced to £30k; TROs for other permanent functions including on-street parking and one-way streets will now be prioritised in association with the Cabinet lead Member.														
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>														
Date: 01/04/2011														
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>									
Effects of Changes on budget														
		Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction											
Staff														
Non Staff Costs		90	60	60	60									
Income														
Net Total		90	60	60	60									
Staffing Implications			2011-12	2012-13	2013-14									
Current service staffing (FTE)														
Post(s) deleted (FTE)														
Current vacancies (FTE)														
Individuals at risk (FTE)														

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 13

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 14												
<u>Purpose of Service</u> In compliance with legislation, to manage the safe flow of traffic through and within the city, including temporary and permanent restrictions (eg roadworks and parking enforcement) and CCTV systems (including Area Traffic Control and City Centre Security).														
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5">Reducing the staff resources involved in the Star Trak system. The Star Trak system is a real time bus passenger information system that gives "next" bus information.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>					Reducing the staff resources involved in the Star Trak system. The Star Trak system is a real time bus passenger information system that gives "next" bus information.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>														
Reducing the staff resources involved in the Star Trak system. The Star Trak system is a real time bus passenger information system that gives "next" bus information.														
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>														
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other														
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>														
The system was introduced in 1999. The company who supply the system (INIT) have discontinued the production of the on board computers and only second-hand parts are available. Nottingham City & County terminated their service level agreement in September 2010 and the continued participation of Derby is therefore under debate. A new business plan for the future Star trak model is being considered but it is likely to be on a much smaller scale. The present team will be reduced significantly, the maintenance contract will be terminated in June and the system will close in September 2011.														
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>														
Date: 01/04/2011														
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>									
		<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>									
Effects of Changes on budget														
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction												
Staff	140	100	100	100										
Non Staff Costs	160													
Income	(300)	(100)	(100)	(100)										
Net Total	0	0	0	0										
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14										
Current service staffing (FTE)		5.3												
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		4.0												
Current vacancies (FTE)		0.0												
Individuals at risk (FTE)		5.3												

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 14

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 15		
Purpose of Service				
<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Highways Maintenance - General cut over the whole highway maintenance service but trying to maintain a very basic service to keep the public highway safe. The staffing impact of reducing the Highways Maintenance budget will be the deletion of 3 posts, 1 in Highways maintenance and 2 in Public Lighting.</p>				
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>				
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other				
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>				
Cuts include : £10k Footway Betterment ,£30k Highway Drainage Maintenance ,£20k Grass Cutting & Verge Maintenance £50k Tree & Shrub Maintenance ,£25k Highway Weed Control , £67k Street Lighting & Signs , £20k Road Markings ,£20k Misc Lights & Seats , £25k survey assessments, £10k Revenue local environment works, £25k Carriageway & Footway Repairs and £10k Watercourses.				
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>				
Date: 01/04/2011				
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2013-14</u> <u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget				
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction		
Staff	620	60	90	90
Non Staff Costs	3,323	312	537	852.
Income	(336)	(30)	(30)	(30)
Net Total	3,607	342	597	912
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Current service staffing (FTE)		21.5		
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		3.0		
Current vacancies (FTE)		2.0		
Individuals at risk (FTE)		19.5		

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 15

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: RH&T DIVISIONAL		Proposal No: RHT 16			
<u>Purpose of Service</u>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Other divisional savings £730k.</p> <p>Review of the Divisional structure following the Senior Management review.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Other divisional savings £730k.</p> <p>Review of the Divisional structure following the Senior Management review.</p>
<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Other divisional savings £730k.</p> <p>Review of the Divisional structure following the Senior Management review.</p>					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
This primarily reflects the further savings required over and above those highlighted in RHT 8. These savings are required as a result of the 30% reduction in the DfT's block capital funding for small transport improvement schemes and the cessation of other funding such as growth point and community infrastructure.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>					
Date: 01/04/2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>
		<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff	6,152	730	730	730	
Non Staff Costs	20,352				
Income	(11,624)				
Net Total	14,880	730	730	730	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		159			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		22			
Current vacancies (FTE)		9			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		150			

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 16

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No

REGENERATION, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

SERVICE AREA: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT		Proposal No: RHT 17			
<u>Purpose of Service</u>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Extra Income from new Pay & Display Bays. – London Road between the Mayfield Road Roundabout and the City Centre , Fox Street, Campbell Street, Buttermere Street, Coniston Street and Filbert Street, Newarke Street</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Extra Income from new Pay & Display Bays. – London Road between the Mayfield Road Roundabout and the City Centre , Fox Street, Campbell Street, Buttermere Street, Coniston Street and Filbert Street, Newarke Street</p>
<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Extra Income from new Pay & Display Bays. – London Road between the Mayfield Road Roundabout and the City Centre , Fox Street, Campbell Street, Buttermere Street, Coniston Street and Filbert Street, Newarke Street</p>					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
Extension of on street pay and display machines to other areas to raise additional income					
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>					
Date: 01/04/2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>
		<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>	<u>£000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existin g Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income	(3,800)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
Net Total	(3,800)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Budget Equality Impact Assessment RHT 17

Race equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: This proposal is not likely to have either a positive or detrimental effect on any racial groups within the city
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? 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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: N/A
Gender equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Disability equality	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?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: No