

Cultural Services Budget Summary 2011/12

Summary

- 1.1 The division has an overall budget reduction of £0.48m in 2011/12 rising to £2.22m by 2013/14.

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 in external funding from Arts Council England, Sports Council etc and other budget pressures.
- 1.3 The division's 2010/11 net budget is £15.54m (£6.25m for Arts and Museums, £4.45m for Libraries, £4.22m for Sports, £0.34m for Marketing and Communications, and £0.28m on Divisional Management).
- 1.4 Growth of £0.57m in 2011/12 reducing to £0.49m by 2013/14 is composed of budget pressures related to De Montfort Hall and running costs associated with the Football Development Project.
- 1.5 Savings of £1.05m in 2011/12 (excluding severance costs which are funded centrally) rising to £2.71m by 2013/14 are proposed. This equates to a saving of 6.7% in 2011/12 (rising to 17.4% by 2013/14) of the £15.54m 2010/11 budget.

Rationale for savings proposals

- 1.6 The approach adopted by the Division is to prioritise, as far as possible, front line service delivery in neighbourhoods with a focus on
- services for City residents
 - targeting services to the most disadvantaged
 - value for money (cost, customer satisfaction, sustainability)
 - tackling inequalities (health, access, community cohesion, and raising attainment
 - ensuring key skills and capacity remain in place to deliver continuing modernisation and partnerships.
- 1.7 Because of the range of services provided by Cultural Services, no one single approach can deliver the scale of savings required. The package of proposals put forward is, therefore, made up of the following:-
- Reductions Agreed 2010/11 (eg Rationalisation of Central Libraries and Reduction of Bars and Creches in Leisure Centres
 - Management/Staffing reductions (Arts and Museums, Sports)
 - Outsourcing (Sports and Museums)
 - Investment/Income Generation (Sports & Museums)
 - Supplies & Services (across all service areas)
 - Reduced Grants (Arts and Sports)

- 1.8 The reduction in posts is 49 over 3 years and the proposals for alternative management in Sports and Leisure will mean that approximately 163 staff will be subject to TUPE. There are currently 12 vacancies.

Risk Assessment

- 1.9 The most significant risks associated with these proposals are those which recommend alternative management arrangements. In the case of Sports, the level of saving could be affected by the procurement timescale, the level of interest from the private and trust sectors and the value of bids submitted.
- 1.10 In the case of Museums, the potential range of solutions and the different potential solutions could affect both timescale and the amount of savings achieved.
- 1.11 In the case of Libraries the savings achieved from the Neighbourhood Hubs proposal will depend on a range of factors including customer consultation and investment in specific buildings to provide a broader range of services. The phasing of expenditure reductions has taken into account the likely timeframe for delivery

Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.12 Impact assessments show that generally the budget cuts will impact on all local communities with no specific groups being disproportionately affected.

Cultural Services (Councillor Wann)

		<u>2011/12</u> £000	<u>2012/13</u> £000	<u>2013/14</u> £000
Budget Pressures Growth:				
CS 1	Ongoing DMH budget shortfall	420	390	340
CS 2	Football Foundation revenue costs	150	150	150
Proposed Savings: ARTS AND MUSEUMS				
CS 3	Full Year effect of changes agreed in 2010/11	(112)	(122)	(122)
CS 4	Alternative management and operational arrangements for 4 museum sites (APS, Belgrave Hall, Jewry Wall and Guildhall): reduction in service level from October 2011.	(50)	(178)	(203)
CS 5	Discontinue plans to replace the City Gallery and boost provision at New Walk Museum.	(35)	(60)	(60)
CS 6	Review staffing structure to reflect new levels of service provision and new model of community engagement.	(75)	(140)	(190)
CS 7	Reduced supplies and services costs.	(15)	(30)	(65)
CS 8	Introduce admission charges for non city residents at new Walk Museum and Newarke Houses Museum.	(0)	(80)	(80)
CS 9	Reduce grant to Curve and Phoenix Square.	(0)	(75)	(150)
LIBRARIES				
CS 10	Complete rationalisation of central Libraries and other 2010/11 full year effects.	(364)	(364)	(389)
CS 11	Supplies and Services reduction.	(30)	(30)	(60)
SPORTS AND LEISURE				
CS 12	Full year effects agreed in 2010/11.	(220)	(220)	(220)
CS 13	Review of Facility management arrangements.	(120)	(244)	(244)
CS 14	Investment opportunity at St. Margaret's Pastures/reduction in opening hours.	(90)	(150)	(150)
CS 15	Alternative Management arrangements (charitable trust) for sports, leisure and golf facilities in the City.	75	(375)	(750)
CS 16	Withdraw funding for City of Leicester swimming coach on a phased basis.	(10)	(15)	(30)
Net Savings		<u>(476)</u> =====	<u>(1,543)</u> =====	<u>(2,223)</u> =====

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Arts and Museums		Proposal No: CS 01			
<u>Purpose of Service</u>					
<i>To manage Leicester's festivals and events programme; De Montfort Hall; participatory and public art; museums, galleries, historic sites and museum collections</i>					
<u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u>					
Growth budget required to address on-going De Montfort Hall budget shortfall as detailed in Cabinet report dated 13 th December 2010.					
<u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Service Improvement					
<u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
Budget comparison work across the industry undertaken to develop a forward business plan for De Montfort Hall has identified that there is a shortfall in the budget allocated to the site. In order to continue to deliver the level of service provision expected of the site to meet SIEP user targets and support its sustainability, action is required to address the funding shortfall. The growth budget will run in parallel with a revised programming policy and an increased level of income generating activities, which reduces the additional budget requirement over a 3 year period.					
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>					
Date: 1 April 2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11 £000s</u>	<u>2011-12 £000s</u>	<u>2012-13 £000s</u>	<u>2013-14 £000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Addition			
Staff	1,466	50	50	50	
Non Staff Costs	3,545	420	490	640	
Income	(4,300)	(50)	(150)	(350)	
Net Total	711	420	390	340	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		n/a	-	-	
Extra post(s) (FTE)		n/a	-	-	

Budget Equality Impact Assessment – CS 01

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: No
	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

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Sports and Leisure		Proposal No: CS 02			
<p><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u> Football Development Project – Revenue funding to support the maintenance and operation of 7 grass based sites, 4 Ball Courts, 3 Full Size Artificial Turf Pitches and associated changing accommodation, lighting etc. Football Foundation is providing £500k revenue support to this project over the next 5 years</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>					
The Football Investment Strategy project addresses the need for strategic investment in football facilities by providing a portfolio of sites across the city and in total eleven sites will benefit from the £11.2 million capital investment in the city. The project which aims to significantly increase participation in football across the city also has significant health benefits and has been financially supported by NHS Leicester City and Sport England as well as the Football Foundation					
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>					
Date: 1 st April 2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11 £000s</u>	<u>2011-12 £000s</u>	<u>2012-13 £000s</u>	<u>2013-14 £000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Addition			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs		150	150	150	
Income					
Net Total		150	150	150	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Extra post(s) (FTE)					

Budget Equality Impact Assessment – CS 02

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: There are only positive quality impacts to be gained from this item. A number of the football teams which will act as partner clubs have a high level of ethnic minority young people playing for their teams. The additional opportunities that arise from this proposal will indeed increase those opportunities.
	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: Only positive implications due to the comments above.
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: One of the partner clubs is Leicester Women's FC, a club that only has female players and promotes the principles of girls' football across the city for all age groups and ethnic groupings. This proposal will enable them to enhance their work, improve activity levels, and in general raise the profile of women's and girls' football in the city.
	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 Partner clubs are required to deliver on a number of particular strands in terms of development. Some of the clubs have been tasked with developing disability football groups and report upon their progress in this field. This work will ensure that opportunities for disabled young people are increased and enhanced in all areas of development.

	<p>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A</p>
<p>Community Cohesion</p>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p> <hr/> <p>Your assessment of impact/risk Many of the clubs detailed as partner clubs have a wide range of ethnic minority players. Indeed, there is ground-share in a number of areas between white and BEM clubs and this interaction, it is anticipated, will enhance community cohesion across the city.</p>

Additional Information

Sites included are:

- Aylestone Playing Fields,
- Rushey Fields,
- Hamilton Park,
- Linwood Playing Fields,
- New College,
- Beaumont Park,
- Aylestone Recreation Ground,

And 4 ball courts situated at Cossington Street, Overton Road, St Andrews Play Association and Victoria Park which are all located within the inner city

Partner Clubs are:

GNG Sports, Leicester City Women, St Andrews Football Club, Allextion and New Parks FC, Beaumont Town FC, Nirvana FC, Aylestone Park FC, Bharat FC.

It will create via ambitious development plans with partner clubs

Summary of KPI's (on 11 sites) over first 5 years

- 283 new teams of which 92 will be female a 1,214% increase
- 3,065 new participants of which 805 will be female a 13% increase
- 126 new disability football players playing on the sites
- 30 new Charter Standard Clubs
- 5,040 overall participants aged 5-11
- 140 social inclusion referrals
- 28 health projects
- 577 new volunteers
- 266 education courses delivered
- 922 school club links created

Summary of ethnicity profiles over 11 sites:

Ethnicity	Current	Proposed	Difference
White	68.00%	63.00%	-5.00%
Asian or British Asian	23.00%	24.00%	1.00%
Black or British Black	5.00%	7.00%	2.00%
Mixed Race	2.00%	3.00%	1.00%
Other	2.00%	3.00%	1.00%

A staffing structure will ensure continual development to ensure opportunities are provide with particular focus on BME and disadvantaged groups.

Partners on this project are Leicester City Council, Football Foundation, Leicester City PCT, The FA, County FA, Sports England, and Leicester City Football Club.

Potential Questions:

Q How will this project help football in the city?

It will enable more young people to participate particularly in BME and disadvantaged backgrounds, gain skills, higher standard of coaching, and clear pathways for progression to playing at high levels

Q Will it help identify talent particularly in BME and disadvantaged groups?

The partner club development plans and staffing structure built into the project will only help to encourage and identify talent in all areas of the community.

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

Service Area: Arts and Museums	Proposal No: CS 03			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> To manage Leicester's festivals and events programme; De Montfort Hall; participatory and public art; museums, galleries, historic sites and museum collections				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Full year effect of changes agreed in 2010/11: Reduce staff in museums outreach service, museums curatorial service and museums operational management; Reduce Community Activity Partnership (CAPS) funds; Close Fosse Arts music studio; Increase income from arts and museums activities. The majority of these actions have been completed in 2010/11. 1 post to be deleted as from August 1, 2011.				
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken				
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced outreach work in the local community, impacting on hard to reach groups Reduced capacity and expertise in taxidermy related conservation Reduced CAPS financial support for arts projects and community festivals Closure of neighbourhood music studio facility Increased focus on income generation activities, potentially providing an increased range of services for users. 				
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>				
				Date: April 2011
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u> £000s	<u>2012-13</u> £000s	<u>2013-14</u> £000s
Effects of Changes on budget				
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction		
Staff (includes FYE savings of posts cut in 10/11)	289	93	93	93
Non Staff Costs	79	9	9	9
Income	(54)	10	20	20
Net Total	314	112	122	122
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Current service staffing (FTE)		1		
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1		
Current vacancies (FTE)				
Individuals at risk (FTE)	11	1		

Equality Impact Assessment – CS 03

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: An element of the proposal will mean that the Service will provide a reduced level of outreach activity to BME groups in Leicester. The Outreach team raises awareness of service provision with hard to reach groups and aims to stimulate individuals to visit museum sites. With a reduced level of activity this would result in a fall in visitor numbers at sites and less individuals benefiting from service provision. In terms of the Service's performance targets, the reduction in Outreach provision could have a negative impact on achieving the Service's demographic targets.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? The Service will aim to develop a stronger inreach focus that encourages individuals from the hard to reach groups to visit sites.
	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 An element of the proposal will mean that the Service will provide a reduced level of outreach activity to disability groups in Leicester. The Outreach team raises awareness

	<p>of service provision with hard to reach groups and aims to stimulate individuals to visit museum sites. With a reduced level of activity this would result in a fall in visitor numbers at sites and less individuals benefiting from service provision. In terms of the Service's performance targets, the reduction in Outreach provision could have a negative impact on achieving the Service's demographic targets.</p>
	<p>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</p> <p>The Service will aim to develop a stronger inreach focus that encourages individuals from the hard to reach groups to visit sites.</p>
<p>Community Cohesion</p>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p> <p>Your assessment of impact/risk</p> <p>An element of the proposal will mean that the Service will provide a reduced level of outreach activity to C2DE groups in Leicester. The Outreach team raises awareness of service provision with hard to reach groups and aims to stimulate individuals to visit museum sites. With a reduced level of activity this would result in a fall in visitor numbers at sites and less individuals benefiting from service provision. In terms of the Service's performance targets, the reduction in Outreach provision could have a negative impact on achieving the Service's demographic targets.</p> <p>The reduction in Festivals and Arts Community Activity Partnership (CAP) funds to £10,000 each would reduce the ability of community groups, individuals and organisations to deliver events and activities. In many cases the funding provides leverage to draw down additional monies from other sources and the absence of the CAPS funding will prevent these other monies being accessed.</p> <p>Actions to increase income generation would mean some customers may have to pay for services that previously were provided at no or low cost. Non-income generating activities may be dropped in order to undertake income generating activities.</p>

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Arts and Museums		Proposal No: CS 04			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> To manage Leicester's festivals and events programme; De Montfort Hall; participatory and public art; museums, galleries, historic sites and museum collections					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Alternative management and operational arrangements for 4 museum sites (Abbey Pumping Station, Belgrave Hall, Jewry Wall Museum and the Guildhall). This potentially may lead to SLA agreements with third parties. N.B. This will require a reduction in the current level of service and opening hours at these sites from October 2011. </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Alternative management and operational arrangements for 4 museum sites (Abbey Pumping Station, Belgrave Hall, Jewry Wall Museum and the Guildhall). This potentially may lead to SLA agreements with third parties. N.B. This will require a reduction in the current level of service and opening hours at these sites from October 2011.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Alternative management and operational arrangements for 4 museum sites (Abbey Pumping Station, Belgrave Hall, Jewry Wall Museum and the Guildhall). This potentially may lead to SLA agreements with third parties. N.B. This will require a reduction in the current level of service and opening hours at these sites from October 2011.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Efficiency/Service Reduction					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service</u>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial significant reduction of opening hours while alternative management and operational arrangements are made User figures will reduce Potentially loss of display space for service collections Opportunity for other organisations to become engaged in reopening and running the sites </td> </tr> </table>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial significant reduction of opening hours while alternative management and operational arrangements are made User figures will reduce Potentially loss of display space for service collections Opportunity for other organisations to become engaged in reopening and running the sites
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial significant reduction of opening hours while alternative management and operational arrangements are made User figures will reduce Potentially loss of display space for service collections Opportunity for other organisations to become engaged in reopening and running the sites 					
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="October 2011"/>	
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11 £000s</u>	<u>2011-12 £000s</u>	<u>2012-13 £000s</u>	<u>2013-14 £000s</u>	
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff	339	90	220	339	
Non Staff Costs	282	0	53	(34)	
Income	(102)	(40)	(95)	(102)	
Net Total	519	50	178	203	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		13	3		
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		10	3		
Current vacancies (FTE)		0.89			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		10	3		

Budget Equality Impact Assessment – CS 04

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: Belgrave Hall and Abbey Pumping Station are in/ near wards with high BME populations but whilst there may be a perception of a local service being reduced for these groups users of these facilities are predominantly white. Abbey Pumping Station and Jewry Wall Museum in particular have strong vocal special interest volunteer groups and all four sites have facility users which are mainly white relatively affluent local and county residents. These groups could see changes as withdrawal of services of particular interest to traditional white communities.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Good communications in advance directly with the groups concerned, and appropriate choice of alternative management provider that will reassure them.
	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: No
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

	<p>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</p> <p>N/a</p>
Community Cohesion	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p>Your assessment of impact/risk</p> <p>No</p>

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Arts and Museums		Proposal No: CS 05			
<u>Purpose of Service</u>					
To manage Leicester's festivals and events programme; De Montfort Hall; participatory and public art; museums, galleries, historic sites and museum collections					
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>					
Discontinue plans to replace the City Gallery. Boost contemporary art provision within New Walk Museum. Reduce current City Gallery staffing levels to 2 FTE based at New Walk Museum, to support contemporary visual art temporary exhibition programming, learning and community engagement.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Service Reduction					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus of arts provision on one site at New Walk Museum to provide a joint offer for both traditional museum users and City Gallery users. • Increased footfall of users to contemporary arts exhibitions. • Reduced impact of potential loss of Arts Council funding. • Efficiency savings from delivering in one building, e.g. one manned reception, combined exhibitions budget. 					
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="July 1 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 (see note above)	194	95	129	129	
Non Staff Costs	117	100	113	113	
Income	(182)	(160)	(182)	(182)	
Net Total	129	35	60	60	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		6.24	2	2	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		4.24			
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)		6.24			

Budget Equality Impact Assessment – CS 05

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: City Gallery users are predominantly from affluent traditional white communities. There are vocal local organisations and individuals who have already set up an on line petition to “save the city gallery” These groups could see changes as withdrawal of services of particular interest to traditional white communities.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Good communications with interested organisations
	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: no
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
--	---

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

Service Area: Arts and Museums		Proposal No: CS 06			
<u>Purpose of Service</u>					
To manage Leicester's festivals and events programme; De Montfort Hall; participatory and public art; museums, galleries, historic sites and museum collections					
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>					
Review museums and participatory arts staffing structure to reflect new levels of service provision whilst retaining essential expertise in order to continue operations in arts management, collections management, curatorial knowledge, exhibitions and access. Increase public access through new models of community engagement including digitised/web based provision.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Efficiency, Service Reduction					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced capacity to manage collections, deliver exhibitions and operate sites. • Potential capacity issues if other options not achievable, e.g. alternative management arrangements for four museum sites. • Improvements in online access to museum collections and community engagement in resource development. 					
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="October 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	418	75	140	190	
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
Net Total	418	75	140	190	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		17.5	13.5	12	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		4	1.5		
Current vacancies (FTE)		1.5			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		13.5	2.5		

Budget Equality Impact Assessment – CS 06

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 involves reduction of museums staff capacity in curatorial, collections and exhibitions areas. The museum service works with a range of (some fundraising) voluntary organisations with special interests relating to the collections and museum sites, with membership from traditional affluent vocal white communities. These groups could see changes as withdrawal of services of particular interest to traditional white communities.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Ensure that the restructure maintains museum service's capacity to deliver curatorial and collections services and communicate effectively with groups concerned.
	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: No
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
	Not directly

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Arts and Museums		Proposal No: CS 07		
<u>Purpose of Service</u>				
To manage Leicester's festivals and events programme; De Montfort Hall; participatory and public art; museums, galleries, historic sites and museum collections				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>				
Reduce museums, participatory arts and festivals supplies and services costs.				
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>				
Service Reduction				
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced expenditure on exhibitions will impact on the number or size of exhibitions. • Reduced expenditure on marketing may impact on visitor/user numbers. • Reduced spending on education will reduce promotional and development work for school sessions. • Reduced spending on festival supplies will require removing small elements of the festivals programme. 				
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>				
				Date: <input type="text" value="April 2011"/>
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11 £000s</u>	<u>2011-12 £000s</u>	<u>2012-13 £000s</u>	<u>2013-14 £000s</u>
Effects of Changes on budget				
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs (excludes De Montfort Hall)	660	15	30	65
Income				
Net Total excludes De Montfort Hall	660	15	30	65
Staffing Implications – N/A		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 – CS 07

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: no
	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

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

Service Area: Arts and Museums		Proposal No: CS 08		
<u>Purpose of Service</u>				
To manage Leicester's festivals and events programme; De Montfort Hall; participatory and public art; museums, galleries, historic sites and museum collections				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>				
Introduce admission charges for adult non-city residents at New Walk Museum and Newarke Houses Museum. This reflects the situation that about half of all users of Leicester's museums live beyond the city boundaries. Some universal free admission periods or arrangements for particular groups could be provided if there was a good business case for them.				
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>				
Other				
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced service users from outside of the City. • Potentially reduced users from the City through perceptions that they have to pay. • Barrier arrangements will need to be installed to allow free access to the shop and café at New Walk Museum. • Potential fall in sales at café and shop. • Low risk of EU challenge over differential charging – discrimination of one group of EU residents, i.e. those outside of the City. 				
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>				
				Date: <input type="text" value="October 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				
Income	0	0	80	80
Net Total	0	0	80	80
Staffing Implications N/A		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 – CS 08

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 will not affect local residents but will affect their adult visiting friends and relatives but will affect all racial groups equally. Main stakeholder groups for museums are from traditional affluent vocal white communities These groups could see changes as withdrawal of services of particular interest to traditional white communities.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?
	Good communications
	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: no
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	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion

Cohesion	or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	Your assessment of impact/risk no

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

Service Area: Arts and Museums		Proposal No: CS 09			
<u>Purpose of Service</u>					
To manage Leicester's festivals and events programme; De Montfort Hall; participatory and public art; museums, galleries, historic sites and museum collections					
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>					
Reduce LCC grants to Curve and Phoenix Square. Under this proposal Curve and Phoenix Square would be expected to adjust their business plans to take into account the reduced levels of funding. Curve £50,000 in 12/13 and £100,000 in 13/14. Phoenix £25,000 in 12/13 and £50,000 in 13/14. Curve budget 10/11 £839,000. Phoenix Square budget 10/11 £311,800					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential reduction in level of service provision and, therefore, user figures. • Risk of impact on the long term sustainability of the venues. • Potential impact on jobs at both venues. 					
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="April 2012"/>	
<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	1,151	0	75	150	
Income					
Net Total	1,151	0	75	150	
Staffing Implications – N/A		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 – CS 09

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 will affect all racial groups equally. Main stakeholder groups for Curve and Phoenix are from traditional affluent vocal white communities. These groups could see changes as withdrawal of services of particular interest to traditional white communities.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? no
	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: no
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? no
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 n/a

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Libraries	Proposal No: CS 10
--------------------------------	---------------------------

Purpose of Service

Delivery of Library Services in the city centre and across neighbourhoods through 17 sites, 2 Bookbuses and a range of partnerships.

Details of Proposed Reduction:

Complete rationalisation of Central Libraries and implement other agreed budget reductions with the exception of the review of Library Opening Hours which will be replaced by a more comprehensive Neighbourhood Hubs review

Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)

Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other

Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)

Reductions agreed in 2010/11 Includes:

- Half Time Older Person's Manager
- Reduce Library Assistant and Cataloguer - Reader Development Services
- Personalisation of Home Library Service – feasibility
- Reduce 0.5 CYPs Librarian
- StoryTeller funded from Children's "Whatever It Takes"
- Community Engagement Officer
- Amalgamation of 2 Central Libraries to enable development of Multi-Access Centre
- Review of Community Facilities

Core development work supporting 4 One Leicester themes in Libraries continues, differently organised, with reduction in some areas, efficiency in central libraries and changes in management.

Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication

Date: April 2011

Financial Implications of Proposal

2010-11 £000s	2011-12 £000s	2012-13 £000s	2013-14 £000s
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

Effects of Changes on budget

	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction		
Staff	3,348	364	364	389
Non Staff Costs	1,463			
Income	(360)			
Net Total	4,451	364	364	389

Staffing Implications

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Current service staffing (FTE)			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	14.3		1
Current vacancies (FTE)			
Individuals at risk (FTE) <i>No further staff at risk as Appx R completed for 11/12 budget by March 2011</i>			1

Budget Equality Impact Assessment - CS 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: Management structure changes have reduced posts but have not reduced ability to provide service to BME/diverse communities.
	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? Mainly City Centre
	Your assessment of impact/risk: Impact of reductions citywide but mostly upon city centre services (central libraries amalgamated into one). However, amalgamation of services will not be detrimental to BME/diversity of users or of range of staff serving customers. All services under one roof will make service more efficient for all communities.
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 gender specific services involved. No services to close but to be delivered through different management.
	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? No
	Your assessment of impact/risk Older People's services that include minibus service for disabled users will continue.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A and monitoring to assess any unpredicted impact
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city? No

	<p>Your assessment of impact/risk Central Library will continue to be a centre of activity promoting community cohesion through volunteering and range of services and activities and staffing and customer profile. Older People's and Children's services will continue to operate but at lower level of activity.</p>
--	---

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Libraries		Proposal No: CS 11												
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Delivery of Library Services in the city centre and across neighbourhoods through 17 sites, 2 Bookbuses and a range of partnerships.														
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5">Reduce Supplies and Services and other support costs and additional as yet unidentified Librarian post.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>					Reduce Supplies and Services and other support costs and additional as yet unidentified Librarian post.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>														
Reduce Supplies and Services and other support costs and additional as yet unidentified Librarian 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>														
No significant implications for SIEP or One Leicester agenda, but efficiency measures that will be achieved through different working and reduction of use of old technologies.														
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>														
Date: April 2011														
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>	<u>2010-11 £000s</u>	<u>2011-12 £000s</u>	<u>2012-13 £000s</u>	<u>2013-14 £000s</u>										
Effects of Changes on budget														
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction												
Staff	30			30										
Non Staff Costs	567	30	30	30										
Income														
Net Total	597	30	30	60										
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14										
Current service staffing (FTE)				1										
Post(s) deleted (FTE)				1										
Current vacancies (FTE)														
Individuals at risk (FTE)				1										

Budget Equality Impact Assessment - CS 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: Low as this proposal concerns supplies and services across the board.
	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 this is citywide
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: Low, as this proposal concerns supplies and services across the board.
	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 Low, as this proposal concerns supplies and services across the board.
	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 N/A

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Sports and Leisure		Proposal No: CS 12			
Purpose of Service: To deliver sport and physical activity opportunities to Leicester residents and beyond which contributes to the health and wellbeing of the city					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>Details of Proposed Reduction: Complete the implementation of all agreed budget reductions in Sports Services with the exception of the reduction in opening hours</p> <p>The EIAs for these were completed last year.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p>Details of Proposed Reduction: Complete the implementation of all agreed budget reductions in Sports Services with the exception of the reduction in opening hours</p> <p>The EIAs for these were completed last year.</p>
<p>Details of Proposed Reduction: Complete the implementation of all agreed budget reductions in Sports Services with the exception of the reduction in opening hours</p> <p>The EIAs for these were completed last year.</p>					
Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)					
Decision already taken, Service Reduction					
Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reconfigure underutilised crèches in leisure centres – now completed. Rooms are now being renovated to deliver alternative activity. 2. Reconfigure loss-making bars. Bars at St Margaret's Pastures and Leicester Leys Leisure Centre now closed. 3. Close Sport on the Road – this has now ceased and the post holder made redundant 4. Sports Regeneration Team - £20,000 to be reduced from the casual coaching budget and £23,000 reduction in one Sports Development Officer being made voluntarily redundant. 					
Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication					
				Date:	
All of these proposals have now been completed				01/04/2011	
Financial Implications of Proposal		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff	247	235	235	235	235
Non Staff Costs	81	45	45	45	45
Income	(66)	(60)	(60)	(60)	(60)
Net Total	262	220	220	220	220
Staffing Implications (Implemented in 2010/11)		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

Service Area: Sports and Leisure		Proposal No: CS 13			
<u>Purpose of Service:</u> To deliver sport and physical activity opportunities to Leicester residents and beyond which contributes to the health and wellbeing of the city					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Review of facility managers'/duty officers' roles to deliver efficiencies by the deletion of seven duty officers posts at all major centres and altering shift rotas to enable facility managers to cover duty officer shift cover. </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Review of facility managers'/duty officers' roles to deliver efficiencies by the deletion of seven duty officers posts at all major centres and altering shift rotas to enable facility managers to cover duty officer shift cover.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Review of facility managers'/duty officers' roles to deliver efficiencies by the deletion of seven duty officers posts at all major centres and altering shift rotas to enable facility managers to cover duty officer shift cover.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Efficiency					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
This proposal will ensure continued service delivery across the city but will put added pressure on facility managers and will require duty officers to work differently, adapting shifts and rotas. It is not expected that the public will notice any major difference in delivery of customer service levels.					
<u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="01/09/2011"/>	
<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	1019	120	244	244	
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
Net Total	1019	120	244	244	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		27			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		7			
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)		27			

Budget Equality Impact Assessment – CS 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

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Sports and Leisure		Proposal No: CS 14																	
Purpose of Service: To deliver sport and physical activity opportunities to Leicester residents and beyond which contributes to the health and wellbeing of the city																			
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5">Details of Proposed Reduction:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a)</td> <td colspan="4">To reduce the opening hours at St Margaret's Pastures Sports Centre to open only at 2pm each weekday, reducing staff hours on the site by 50 hours per week</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b)</td> <td colspan="4">To increase income by investing in the development of a goals and hockey centre (replicating the Goals 5 a side model) running tournaments and delivering a much more commercial proposal for the site</td> </tr> </table>					Details of Proposed Reduction:					a)	To reduce the opening hours at St Margaret's Pastures Sports Centre to open only at 2pm each weekday, reducing staff hours on the site by 50 hours per week				b)	To increase income by investing in the development of a goals and hockey centre (replicating the Goals 5 a side model) running tournaments and delivering a much more commercial proposal for the site			
Details of Proposed Reduction:																			
a)	To reduce the opening hours at St Margaret's Pastures Sports Centre to open only at 2pm each weekday, reducing staff hours on the site by 50 hours per week																		
b)	To increase income by investing in the development of a goals and hockey centre (replicating the Goals 5 a side model) running tournaments and delivering a much more commercial proposal for the site																		
Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)																			
Service Reduction, Increased Income																			
Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)																			
a)	St Margaret's Pastures Sports Centre is very poorly used during the daytime hours, Monday to Friday. The proposal to reduce the opening hours will necessitate moving our existing bookings to the afternoon if it is to continue. Currently, very few people access the gym in the morning at the centre, and they will be unable to do so until the afternoon.																		
b)	The development of a 5 a side soccer centre will generate increased income and will be subject to an invest to save application, the costs of which are included in this proposal.																		
Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication																			
				Date:	01/07/2011														
Financial Implications of Proposal		2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14														
		£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s														
Effects of Changes on budget																			
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction																	
Staff	152	30	40	40															
Non Staff Costs	70																		
Income	(156)	60	110	110															
Net Total	66	90	150	150															
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14															
Current service staffing (FTE)		5.5																	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1.5																	
Current vacancies (FTE)																			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		2																	

Budget Equality Impact Assessment – CS 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: No
	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: N/A
	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: Yes, one group currently meets at the site in the mornings
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? We will ask them to move to an afternoon slot in future.
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: N/A

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Sports and Leisure		Proposal No: CS 15			
Purpose of Service: To deliver sport and physical activity opportunities to Leicester residents and beyond which contributes to the health and wellbeing of the city					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> Details of Proposed Reduction: Alternative Management arrangements for Sports and leisure facilities i.e. trusts, existing trust or private sector to maximise financial benefits and savings to the council without significantly impacting on services to customers. </td> </tr> </table>					Details of Proposed Reduction: Alternative Management arrangements for Sports and leisure facilities i.e. trusts, existing trust or private sector to maximise financial benefits and savings to the council without significantly impacting on services to customers.
Details of Proposed Reduction: Alternative Management arrangements for Sports and leisure facilities i.e. trusts, existing trust or private sector to maximise financial benefits and savings to the council without significantly impacting on services to customers.					
Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate) Efficiency					
Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan) Preparation work prior to tendering out the sports, leisure and golf facilities in the city will need to be thorough, robust and transparent to ensure much of the good work currently undertaken in the areas of children and young people, health and wellbeing, hard-to-reach groups, and older people is protected so that the customer is unaffected by the change of service provider.					
Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication					
				Date:	01/07/2012
Financial Implications of Proposal	2010-11 £000s	2011-12 £000s	2012-13 £000s	2013-14 £000s	
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff	5,310				
Non Staff Costs	4,201	(75)	375	750	
Income	(5,298)				
Net Total	4,213	(75)	375	750	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		162.83			
Post(s) deleted (FTE) TUPE applies					
Current vacancies (FTE)		10			
Individuals at risk (FTE) TUPE applies					

Budget Equality Impact Assessment – CS 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: There is a potential for some ethnic groups to be excluded from accessing sports facilities if the new provider concentrates on attracting one ethnic group over another
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Steps to stipulate access to all racial groups in the city will need to be clearly referenced within the specification
	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: There is a potential for one gender group to be excluded from accessing sports facilities if the new provider concentrates on attracting one gender group over another
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Steps to stipulate access to all gender groups in the city will need to be clearly referenced within the specification
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: There is a potential for one group to be excluded from accessing sports facilities if the new provider concentrates on attracting one group over another
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Steps to stipulate access to all groups in the city will need to be clearly referenced within the specification
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: Steps to stipulate access to all groups in the city will need to be clearly referenced within the specification

**CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

Service Area: Sports and Leisure		Proposal No: CS 16			
Purpose of Service: To deliver sport and physical activity opportunities to Leicester residents and beyond which contributes to the health and wellbeing of the city					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> Details of Proposed Reduction: The City of Leicester Swimming Club is recognised as the pinnacle for competitive swimming in the city. To encourage performance, Leicester City Council pays the head coach fees for the club. This proposal will reduce that contribution year on year until 2013/2014 when it will be removed completely. </td> </tr> </table>					Details of Proposed Reduction: The City of Leicester Swimming Club is recognised as the pinnacle for competitive swimming in the city. To encourage performance, Leicester City Council pays the head coach fees for the club. This proposal will reduce that contribution year on year until 2013/2014 when it will be removed completely.
Details of Proposed Reduction: The City of Leicester Swimming Club is recognised as the pinnacle for competitive swimming in the city. To encourage performance, Leicester City Council pays the head coach fees for the club. This proposal will reduce that contribution year on year until 2013/2014 when it will be removed completely.					
Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)					
Service Reduction					
Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)					
The City of Leicester head coach has in recent years had some notable swimmers being taught at the club. These swimmers will hope to be members of the GB 2012 swimming squad. The reduction on a sliding scale will ensure that this coaching is supported up to and beyond the 2012 Games whilst contributing to the service's savings. It should be noted that the majority of the Club's swimmers are not City Residents.					
Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication					
				Date: 01/04/2011	
Financial Implications of Proposal	2010-11 £000s	2011-12 £000s	2012-13 £000s	2013-14 £000s	
Effects of Changes on budget					
	Existing Budget	Proposed Reduction			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs	30	10	15	30	
Income					
Net Total	30	10	15	30	
Staffing Implications (Not Employed by LCC)		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 – CS 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: No
	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