

Environmental Services Budget Summary 2011/12

Summary & Background

- 1.1 The budget proposals have been made in the context of a 30% reduction in revenue support grant over a 4 year period. The Division's net budget for 2010/11 is £26.2m, though £12.5m of this relates to the long-term waste management contract with Biffa.
- 1.2 Savings totalling £1.37m in 2011/12, rising to £2.43m in 2013/14 have been identified across all areas and there are budget pressures totalling £0.6m from 2011/12 onwards.

Rationale for savings and proposals

- 1.3 The Division incorporates many of the Council's regulatory services: environmental health, licensing, trading standards and building control, with a total net budget of £4.3m. The vast majority of these regulatory services are statutory services, many of which have been reduced in previous budget strategies to something approaching which may be considered the statutory minimum.
- 1.4 Building control and licensing generate significant income, relatively low net budgets and are generally subject to legal constraints over not generating surpluses. Building control is also suffering significant shortfalls in income as a consequence of the economic downturn, presenting a predicted budget pressure of £250k in 2011/12.
- 1.5 The scope for making significant savings within these regulatory services would therefore appear to be limited. However, approximately £278k of savings have been identified for 2011/12, some of which were contained within the budget agreed in February 2010. To deliver the scale of savings required by the budget strategy would require significant reductions in important services such as the food safety service. The only alternative would be to identify major efficiency savings and probably the best opportunity to achieve this is by looking to provide a county-wide shared service for regulatory services. Discussions with other local authorities are under-way and it is expected that a detailed business case will be developed in the coming months. Experience from Worcestershire has shown that such a proposal can deliver at least 17% savings and this forms the basis for the £630k savings from 2012/13 contained within these budget proposals.
- 1.6 Street cleaning has been the subject of significant investment in recent years, which has resulted in levels of street cleanliness improving. The Council has also invested in City Wardens and the Enviro-crime team who are now working citywide to reduce the incidence of litter, flytipping, etc. and which is now beginning to reap dividends (e.g. through major reductions in flytipping in the city). Therefore, savings proposals in street cleaning totalling £647k, rising to £717k in 2012/13,

are focussed on minimising any adverse impact on street cleanliness standards as much as possible. In particular, the contract for the Applied Sweepers was due for renewal in 2011 and it is therefore proposed to reduced the number of mechanical sweepers from 17 to 6, thereby saving £447k, with the drivers being redeployed to the manual sweeping teams. This will build on the success of the Cleaner City team in the city centre, in moving away from mechanical cleansing. A further £200k will be saved by not using agency staff to cover for holidays and short-term sickness, which also helps to minimise the impact of budget reductions on council employees.

- 1.7 Most waste management budgets relate to the long-term Biffa contract which limits the scope for budget savings. The service also has a £364k budget pressure as a consequence of a Retail Prices Index (on which the annual price increase is based) forecast to be higher than the standard budget assumption of 2%.
- 1.8 The Council has recently approved a scheme of improvement works for Gilroes crematorium and cemetery which will ensure that the cremators comply with mercury abatement requirements, but will also provide other major improvements to this important facility. Against this background of improvements, there is limited scope for delivering significant savings within Bereavement Services without reducing service standards. Efficiency savings of £22k, rising to £79k in 2012/13 have been identified. The only other means to generate savings is through an above inflation increase in fees and charges, which was introduced on 24th January, following on from the decision made by Cabinet in December 2010. However, this increase was not applied to cremation charges, in view of the increases in those charges made to fund the Gilroes crematorium improvement works.
- 1.9 The majority of Parks & Green Spaces services have been experiencing significant budget pressures in recent years, largely as a consequence of year-on-year increases in the area of land, number of trees and play areas for which they are responsible, coupled with increased expectations from the public and climate change impacts (e.g. now having to cut grass over a much longer growing season). The Greenspace Strategy will hopefully provide a means of addressing some of these budget pressures in the longer term, but attempts have been made to avoid putting additional pressure on already overstretched budgets in the meantime.
- 1.10 In addition to the Bereavement Services' savings, a further £438k of savings, rising to £624k by 2013/14, have been identified within Parks & Green Spaces. Wherever possible, low-impact savings have been identified, but to deliver the scale of savings being sought a significant reduction in staffing levels is required. Therefore a service-wide organisational review will be undertaken, with the aim of maximising management and other organisational savings to minimise the impact on front-line services as much as possible. Potential synergies with

similarly area-based street cleaning services will also be explored. It is inevitable however that there will need to be some significant service reductions in certain areas.

- 1.11 Over the 3 year period there will be a reduction of 19 posts excluding the impact of the shared service proposal for regulatory services.

Risk Assessment

- 1.11 The principal risk is associated with the proposal for a shared service for regulatory services, which is dependant on the agreement of all local authorities. The savings in relation to this do not come into effect until 2012/13, which provides time to identify alternative savings should the need arise. There are other potentially significant risks with some of the proposals, particularly those relating to street cleaning, should these changes have a more detrimental impact on street cleanliness standards than is anticipated, and within Parks & Green Spaces should the reduction in management and staffing levels have a more detrimental impact on levels of service than anticipated. However, the fact that these closely related local environmental services and their relatively large budgets are managed within the same Division does provide an important means of mitigating these risks.

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.

Environmental Services
(Councillor Russell/Councillor Wann)

		<u>2011/12</u> £000	<u>2012/13</u> £000	<u>2013/14</u> £000
Budget Pressures :				
ES1	Inflation differential on Biffa unitary charge	364	364	364
ES2	Building control shortfall in income	250	250	250
Proposed Savings :				
ES3	Reduced demand from Bradgate Park Trust	(15)	(15)	(15)
ES4	Loss of Head of Service post and other organisational changes.	(90)	(90)	(90)
ES5	Shared service in regulatory services.	(0)	(630)	(630)
ES6	Subscriptions and membership fees.	(7)	(7)	(7)
ES7	Private sector housing: loss of 1 post.	(45)	(45)	(45)
ES8	Trading standards: loss of 1 post and closure of Consumer Advice Centre.	(78)	(78)	(78)
ES9	Health and Safety: Loss of 1 post.	(45)	(45)	(45)
ES10	Additional licensing income (for noise control)	(20)	(20)	(20)
ES11	Street cleaning: Reduction in the number of applied sweepers and street washing savings	(447)	(447)	(447)
ES12	Street cleaning: Agency savings – no cover for holidays or short-term sickness.	(200)	(200)	(200)
ES13	Street cleaning: management reduction.	(0)	(70)	(70)
ES14	Bereavement services: increase in charges – already agreed.	(80)	(80)	(80)
ES15	Bereavement services: management restructuring and loss of gardener post.	(22)	(79)	(79)
ES16	Deletion of Leicester in bloom and city centre hanging basket budgets.	(97)	(97)	(97)
ES17	Reduction in management and staffing levels in parks and open spaces.	(183)	(254)	(299)
ES18	Rationalisation of parks fleet.	(12)	(12)	(12)
ES19	Agency budget reduction service-wide in Parks/Green Spaces.	(90)	(90)	(90)
ES20	Reduction of park and play area locking service.	(40)	(40)	(40)
ES21	10% increase in car parking charges.	(16)	(16)	(16)
ES22	Other reductions in supplies and services budgets (Parks/Green Spaces).	(0)	(70)	(70)
	Less Staff costs incurred during review and notice period	116		
Net Savings		<u>(757)</u> =====	<u>(1,771)</u> =====	<u>(1,816)</u> =====

BASE BUDGET INCREASE PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Waste services		Proposal No: ES1			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision of waste collection services in the city.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Increase:</u> The waste PFI (Private Finance Initiative) contract with Biffa provides for an inflationary increase per annum based on RPIX (retail prices index excluding mortgage payments) at the beginning of the financial year. This growth will provide sufficient additional budget over and above the standard inflationary budget increase of 2% based on our current forecast for RPIX. </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Increase:</u> The waste PFI (Private Finance Initiative) contract with Biffa provides for an inflationary increase per annum based on RPIX (retail prices index excluding mortgage payments) at the beginning of the financial year. This growth will provide sufficient additional budget over and above the standard inflationary budget increase of 2% based on our current forecast for RPIX.
<u>Details of Proposed Increase:</u> The waste PFI (Private Finance Initiative) contract with Biffa provides for an inflationary increase per annum based on RPIX (retail prices index excluding mortgage payments) at the beginning of the financial year. This growth will provide sufficient additional budget over and above the standard inflationary budget increase of 2% based on our current forecast for RPIX.					
<u>Type of increase (delete as appropriate)</u> Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> None.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 April 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 increase			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs	12,485	364	364	364	364
Income					
Net Total	12,485	364	364	364	364
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Environmental Services

ES1 Inflation differential on Biffa unitary charge (Budget Pressure)

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BUDGET INCREASE PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services

SERVICE AREA Building control		Proposal No: ES2												
<u>Purpose of Service</u> To provide a building control services														
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed increase:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5">The level of building control income has reduced by 30% over the last 2 years as a result of the economic recession. The current budget level of income is unsustainable and this growth will provide a more realistic target given the current state of the property market.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed increase:</u>					The level of building control income has reduced by 30% over the last 2 years as a result of the economic recession. The current budget level of income is unsustainable and this growth will provide a more realistic target given the current state of the property market.				
<u>Details of Proposed increase:</u>														
The level of building control income has reduced by 30% over the last 2 years as a result of the economic recession. The current budget level of income is unsustainable and this growth will provide a more realistic target given the current state of the property market.														
<u>Type of increase (delete as appropriate)</u> Other														
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> None.														
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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 increase												
Staff	835													
Non Staff Costs	149													
Income	(762)	250	250	250										
Net Total	222	250	250	250										
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14										
Current service staffing (FTE)														
Post(s) deleted (FTE)														
Current vacancies (FTE)														
Individuals at risk (FTE)														

Environmental Services
ES2 Building Control shortfall in income (Budget Pressure)

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Divisional Management		Proposal No: ES3			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> The City Council makes an annual contribution towards the running costs of the Bradgate Park and Swithland Wood Country Park.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduced contribution required by Bradgate Park Trust for 2011/12.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduced contribution required by Bradgate Park Trust for 2011/12.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduced contribution required by Bradgate Park Trust for 2011/12.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> None.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	65	15	15	15	
Income					
Net Total	65	15	15	15	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		n/a	n/a	n/a	
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)		9			

Environmental Services

ES3 Reduced demand from Bradgate Park Trust

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Divisional Management		Proposal No: ES4			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Management within the Environmental Services Division					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Loss of one Head of Service post and other organisational changes within the Division.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Loss of one Head of Service post and other organisational changes within the Division.</p>
<p><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></p> <p>Loss of one Head of Service post and other organisational changes within the Division.</p>					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u>					
Efficiency					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>					
None, though by reducing from 6 to 5 Heads of Service within the Division, management capacity will be reduced.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u>					
Date: 1 st April 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	400	66	66	66	
Non Staff Costs	149	24	24	24	
Income					
Net Total	549	90	90	90	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		6			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1			
Current vacancies (FTE)		0			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		6			

Environmental Services

ES4 Loss of Head of Service post and other organisational changes

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No significant impact. All current postholders are White.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No significant impact. All current postholders are male.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Division (Regulatory Services)		Proposal No: ES5			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> The provision of regulatory services, comprising environmental health, licensing, trading standards and building control.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Achieving efficiency savings through delivering regulatory services via a county-wide shared service from 2012/13. Should this not be achievable, there would need to be a major reduction in management and front-line officer posts to deliver equivalent savings.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Achieving efficiency savings through delivering regulatory services via a county-wide shared service from 2012/13. Should this not be achievable, there would need to be a major reduction in management and front-line officer posts to deliver equivalent savings.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Achieving efficiency savings through delivering regulatory services via a county-wide shared service from 2012/13. Should this not be achievable, there would need to be a major reduction in management and front-line officer posts to deliver equivalent savings.					
<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> There will inevitably be some service implications, but these cannot be identified at this stage. The key objective will be to deliver efficiency savings through bringing together regulatory services, as an alternative to front-line service reductions. Staffing implications cannot be identified at the present time as savings will be achieved through reduction in both staffing and non-staffing costs, the relative proportions of which cannot be identified at this early stage. However, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in management posts, though the specific impact on City Council employees cannot be identified at present.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 2012					
<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	4,570	0	630	630	
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
Net Total	4,570	0	630	630	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		c.120	c.120	c.120	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	Not known	Not known	
Current vacancies (FTE)		2	Not known	Not known	
Individuals at risk (FTE)	13	0	Not known	Not known	

Environmental Services

ES5 Shared service in regulatory services

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact anticipated.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact anticipated.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact anticipated.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Division overall		Proposal No: ES6			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Environmental services.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Savings in subscriptions & membership fees paid across the Division. </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Savings in subscriptions & membership fees paid across the Division.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Savings in subscriptions & membership fees paid across the Division.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> None.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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		0	0	0	0
Non Staff Costs (subscriptions)	12	7	7	7	7
Income					
Net Total	12	7	7	7	7
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0	0	
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Environmental Services

ES6 Subscriptions and membership fees

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Street Scene Enforcement: Private Sector Housing		Proposal No: ES7												
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Providing statutory enforcement & regulation services in relation to private sector rented housing accommodation, including the licensing of houses in multiple occupation.														
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5">To reduce the team by one FTE post.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>					To reduce the team by one FTE post.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u>														
To reduce the team by one FTE post.														
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decision already taken/Service Reduction														
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This will result in a reduction in the amount of work undertaken by the team and is likely to result in a reduction in the number of inspections undertaken and service requests dealt with. The specific nature of work that will not be undertaken cannot be identified at this stage as this will be reviewed and prioritised on an on-going basis so as to ensure that work with a relatively high priority is protected. N.B. This is as agreed on 24/02/10.														
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	274	45	45	45										
Non Staff Costs														
Income														
Net Total	274	45	45	45										
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14										
Current service staffing (FTE)		6.55												
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1												
Current vacancies (FTE)		1												
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0												
17														

Environmental Services

ES7 Private Sector Housing: loss of 1 post

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services

SERVICE AREA Business Regulation: Trading Standards		Proposal No:ES8			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> To provide a wide range of services in relation to trading standards and consumer protection within the city.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the service by one FTE post and closure of the Consumer Advice Centre in Bishop Street N.B. The staffing reduction is as agreed on 24/02/2010. </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the service by one FTE post and closure of the Consumer Advice Centre in Bishop Street N.B. The staffing reduction is as agreed on 24/02/2010.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the service by one FTE post and closure of the Consumer Advice Centre in Bishop Street N.B. The staffing reduction is as agreed on 24/02/2010.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Service Reduction					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This will reduce the capacity of the service to undertake business inspections, investigations and deal with service requests from businesses and the public. The specific nature of work that will not be undertaken cannot be identified at this stage as this will be reviewed and prioritised on an on-going basis so as to ensure that work with a relatively high priority is protected. The closure of the Consumer Advice Centre will involve the loss of a dedicated "face to face" public access point for consumer protection & trading standards advice, though the Council's main customer services centre can be used as an alternative access point.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	709	45	45	45	
Non Staff Costs	132	33	33	33	
Income	(21)				
Net Total	819	78	78	78	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		21.5			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1			
Current vacancies (FTE)		1			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0			

Environmental Services

ES8 Trading Standards: loss of 1 post and closure of Consumer Advice Centre

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	The closure of the CAC will impact more on some racial groups.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	The Somali community living in the St Matthews area are significant users of the Centre.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

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

The proposal is to close the CAC building and remodel the public's face to face contact the Trading Standards. The advice centre is located in a prominent and easily accessible location and receives around 7,000 unique visitors per year (some of which return a number of times for assistance with their problems). Of these around 80% rely on face-to-face contact due to poor mastery of spoken and written English, poor communication skills generally, lack of confidence. Problems include utility bill disputes, bank loans, phone contracts, building disputes.

A high proportion of those relying on face-to-face contact are from the following ethnic groups: Indian Muslims, Somali and Polish; and on senior members of the White British Community. It is estimated that 3,500 members of BME groups will be effected by the proposal to remodel the service.

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

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

See response to Q1 above.

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

There are a number of options for remodelling face-to-face customer contact with the Trading Standards Service and maintain accessibility to appropriate advice and assistance.

The following options will be considered:

- (1) Customer Services Officers taking up first contact and providing a "triage" for enquiries. CSOs are already experienced in dealing with people with language difficulties and could be trained to handle simpler consumer enquiries. In appropriate cases Trading Standards officers could be called to speak to the person or make an appointment which would help reduce time wasted when people not seeking advice.

- (2) Co-locating a Trading Standards Officer in the Customer Service Centre or other city centre based location for example in one of the advice agencies.
- (3) To co-locate a Trading Standards Officer on suregery basis in some of the neighbourhood hubs. However this must be an efficient & effective use of what are now very valuable staffing resources.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services

SERVICE AREA Health & Safety (Enforcement) Team		Proposal No: ES9			
<u>Purpos of Service</u> The team is responsible for the Council's statutory responsibilities as the enforcing authority for approx. 5,700 workplaces in the city, undertaking proactive & reactive workplace inspections, accident & complaint investigations and requests for advice from businesses. The team is also responsible for regulating tattooists, body piercing & acupuncture premises, safety at sports grounds and enforcing smoke free legislation. <input type="checkbox"/>					
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the team by one FTE post. N.B. This supersedes the £90k (2 FTE) budget reduction agreed on 24/02/10.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> There will be a 10% reduction in the amount of health & safety enforcement work (as described above) undertaken within the city. However, the effect of this service reduction will be mitigated by risk prioritisation of the work undertaken by the team.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	349	45	45	45	
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
Net Total	349	45	45	45	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		10			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1			
Current vacancies (FTE) (within service area)		1			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0			

Environmental Services

ES9 Health & Safety (enforcement): Loss of 1 post

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services

SERVICE AREA Licensing & Pollution Control		Proposal No: ES10			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> To provide a range of statutory licensing services within the city.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increase in the service's income budget by £20,000 to reflect increased income received in recent years, with the additional income being used to support licensing-related work undertaken by the Noise Team.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increase in the service's income budget by £20,000 to reflect increased income received in recent years, with the additional income being used to support licensing-related work undertaken by the Noise Team.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increase in the service's income budget by £20,000 to reflect increased income received in recent years, with the additional income being used to support licensing-related work undertaken by the Noise Team.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Other					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> None.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	(675)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)
Net Total	(675)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		n/a	n/a	n/a	
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Environmental Services

ES10 Additional licensing income (for Noise Control)

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Cleansing & Waste Management		Proposal No: ES11			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Street cleaning.					
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reducing the number of Applied (mechanical) Sweepers from 17 to 6 and street washing savings.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Whilst the Applied Sweeper drivers will be redeployed to manual street cleaning teams, the reduction in mechanical sweeping will have an adverse effect on detritus levels and possibly also on the levels of visible litter in the city. On the other hand, the reduction in mechanical sweeping will significantly reduce carbon emissions from street cleaning operations. In view of the high operating costs of the street washer, this will not be used as a matter of routine, but will be deployed for specific purposes, as and when required.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> <p align="right">Date: 1st April 2011</p>					
<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	1,366	447	447	447	
Income					
Net Total	1,366	447	447	447	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		n/a	n/a	n/a	
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Environmental Services

ES11 Street cleaning: Reduction in the number of Applied Sweepers etc.

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Cleansing & Waste Management		Proposal No: ES12		
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Street cleaning.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Street Cleaning agency savings - no cover for holidays or short-term sickness.				
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction				
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Agency staff are currently used to provide cover for absences within street cleaning teams. Removing this cover (other than for long-term sickness) will significantly reduce street cleaning resources and teams with absent staff will be unable to fully complete their scheduled rounds. This will result in some streets not being swept every week, as is currently the case, and will have an adverse effect on levels of street cleanliness in affected areas of the city.				
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> <p align="right">Date: 1st April 2011</p>				
<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	344	200	200	200
Non Staff Costs				
Income				
Net Total	344	200	200	200
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		n/a	n/a	n/a
Current vacancies (FTE)				
Individuals at risk (FTE)				

Environmental Services

ES12 Street Cleaning: Agency savings

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Cleansing & Waste Management		Proposal No: ES13			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Street cleaning.					
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Management and organisational savings.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Efficiency					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> The area management arrangements within Cleansing Services will be reviewed in parallel with the review of Parks & Green Spaces, with a view to identifying efficiency savings. The full staffing implications are therefore not known at the present time. No significant service impacts are envisaged.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 2012					
<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	497	0	70	70	
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
Net Total	497	0	70	70	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		14	14	14	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	c.2	c.2	
Current vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	2	2	

Environmental Services

ES13 Street cleaning: management reduction

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTIN PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces: Bereavement Services		Proposal No: ES14							
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision of bereavement services in the city.									
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increase in non-cremation Bereavement Services fees and charges to deliver 10% above inflation increase in income.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increase in non-cremation Bereavement Services fees and charges to deliver 10% above inflation increase in income.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Increase in non-cremation Bereavement Services fees and charges to deliver 10% above inflation increase in income.									
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken (Cabinet: 13/12/2010)									
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> None.									
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: Already implemented									
<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	(791)	(80)	(80)	(80)					
Net Total	(791)	(80)	(80)	(80)					
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14					
Current service staffing (FTE)									
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		n/a	n/a	n/a					
Current vacancies (FTE)									
Individuals at risk (FTE)									

Environmental Services

ES14 Bereavement services: Increase in charges – already agreed

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	There may be minor impacts on some groups more than others.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

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

The 10% above inflation increase in non-cremation fees and charges will impact less on racial groups who mainly choose cremation.

As background, in October 2010 cremation charges were increased significantly to provide a means of funding mercury abatement works and general improvements at Gilroes crematorium. It was therefore deliberately decided to exclude cremation charges from this above inflation increase in charges, in order to try and be equitable to all diversity groups.

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

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

Not applicable – see explanation given in response to Q1

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

Not applicable – see explanation given in response to Q1

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces: Bereavement Services		Proposal No: ES15			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision of bereavement services in the city.					
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Bereavement Services management restructuring and loss of one FTE gardener post.					
<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> The Gilroes Crematorium improvement works will allow the centrally-based support team to be re-located to Gilroes, which will enable a more efficient management structure to be put in place. The staffing implications detailed below are estimates only and cannot be fully assessed until the organisational review has been completed. This element of the budget reduction will have no significant impact, though the overall changes should improve the quality of service provided. The loss of one gardener post may have an impact on cemetery standards, though it is hoped that this will not be significant.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	809	22	79	79	
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
Net Total	809	22	79	79	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		30	29		
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	2		
Current vacancies (FTE)		2	1		
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	4		

Environmental Services

ES15 Bereavement services: management re-structuring and loss of 1 gardener post

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTIN PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces		Proposal No: ES16			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Deletion of the Leicester in Bloom and the (pre-L.I.B.) city centre hanging basket budget (£22K). N.B. Deletion of the Leicester in Bloom budget (£75K) from 2011/12 was agreed on 24/02/2010, with the £75K budget for 2010/11 being used to provide a reduced level of funding (approx £25K p.a.) up until the end of 2012/13, whilst additional external funding was sought. </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Deletion of the Leicester in Bloom and the (pre-L.I.B.) city centre hanging basket budget (£22K). N.B. Deletion of the Leicester in Bloom budget (£75K) from 2011/12 was agreed on 24/02/2010, with the £75K budget for 2010/11 being used to provide a reduced level of funding (approx £25K p.a.) up until the end of 2012/13, whilst additional external funding was sought.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Deletion of the Leicester in Bloom and the (pre-L.I.B.) city centre hanging basket budget (£22K). N.B. Deletion of the Leicester in Bloom budget (£75K) from 2011/12 was agreed on 24/02/2010, with the £75K budget for 2010/11 being used to provide a reduced level of funding (approx £25K p.a.) up until the end of 2012/13, whilst additional external funding was sought.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Service Reduction					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Loss of theses budgets will dramatically reduce the quantity and quality of floral displays in the city, particularly within the centre, unless external funding/sponsorship opportunities can be secured. The £50K planned underspend from 2010/11 will be used (£25K p.a.) in 2011/12 and 2012/13 as "pump-priming" funding for city centre floral displays and similar local community initiatives.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> <p align="right">Date: 1st April 2011</p>					
<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	97	97	97	97	97
Income					
Net Total	97	97	97	97	97
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Environmental Services

ES16 Deletion of Leicester in Bloom and city centre hanging baskets

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces		Proposal No: ES17			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduction in management and staffing levels in parks and open spaces.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduction in management and staffing levels in parks and open spaces.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduction in management and staffing levels in parks and open spaces.					
<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> This represents a significant reduction in staffing resources within Parks & Green Spaces. An organisational review will be undertaken which will aim to maximise management savings, so as to minimise the impact on front-line staff and services as much as possible. However there will inevitably be an impact on the quality of services provided within the city, though the precise details cannot be identified at the present time. Similarly, the staffing implications detailed below are indicative only at this stage.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	6,114,900	183,000	254,000	299,000	
Non Staff Costs					
Income					
Net Total	6,114,900	183,000	254,000	299,000	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)		231			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		6	2	2	
Current vacancies (FTE)		5			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		Not known			

Environmental Services

ES17 Reduction in management and staffing levels in parks

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact anticipated.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact anticipated.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact anticipated.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact anticipated.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces		Proposal No: ES18			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Rationalisation of Parks fleet.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Rationalisation of Parks fleet.
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Rationalisation of Parks fleet.					
<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> This involves reducing the Parks fleet by two vehicles, linked to the reduction in staffing levels and will, in itself, have a minimal impact on services provided.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	535	12	12	12	
Income					
Net Total	535	12	12	12	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Environmental Services

ES18 Rationalisation of parks fleet

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces		Proposal No: ES19							
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city.									
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Agency budget reduction service-wide.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Agency budget reduction service-wide.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Agency budget reduction service-wide.									
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction									
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> Because of the highly seasonal nature of much of the work undertaken within Parks & Green Spaces, supplementing the permanent workforce with agency staff during peak seasons is a logical means of managing some of the highly variable workloads. However, the service will make a significant reduction in the amount of agency work undertaken and this may have a detrimental effect on the service's ability to respond to peak seasonal workloads.									
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> <p align="right">Date: 1st April 2011</p>									
<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	200	90	90	90					
Non Staff Costs									
Income									
Net Total	200	90	90	90					
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14					
Current service staffing (FTE)									
Post(s) deleted (FTE)									
Current vacancies (FTE)									
Individuals at risk (FTE)									

Environmental Services

ES19 Agency budget reduction service-wide in P&GS

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces		Proposal No: ES20							
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city.									
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5"><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduction in park & play area locking services.</td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduction in park & play area locking services.				
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Reduction in park & play area locking services.									
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction									
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This is an externally provided service. Experience has shown that the out-of-hours locking of parks and play areas does not provide a foolproof means of preventing theft and vandalism, though it probably does help to reduce certain forms of anti-social behaviour (e.g. vehicle related) in particular. It is impossible to determine the extent to which problems will arise as a consequence of reducing this service. However, the reductions will be introduced on a risk prioritised basis and the impact of any changes will be monitored at all affected locations.									
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> <p align="right">Date: 1st April 2011</p>									
<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	65	40	40	40	40				
Income									
Net Total	65	40	40	40	40				
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14					
Current service staffing (FTE)									
Post(s) deleted (FTE)									
Current vacancies (FTE)									
Individuals at risk (FTE)									

Environmental Services

ES20 Reduction in park & play area locking service

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No significant impact anticipated.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Green Spaces		Proposal No: ES21			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> 10% above inflation increase in Parks car parking charges, where charges currently apply (Victoria Park, Abbey Park Road & Slater Street). </td> </tr> </table>					<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> 10% above inflation increase in Parks car parking charges, where charges currently apply (Victoria Park, Abbey Park Road & Slater Street).
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> 10% above inflation increase in Parks car parking charges, where charges currently apply (Victoria Park, Abbey Park Road & Slater Street).					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Other.					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> No significant impact is envisaged.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 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	(168)	(16)	(16)	(16)	
Net Total	(168)	(16)	(16)	(16)	
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Environmental Services

ES21 10% increase in parking charges

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.

BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12
Environmental Services Division

SERVICE AREA Parks & Open Spaces		Proposal No: ES22			
<u>Purpose of Service</u> Provision and maintenance of attractive parks and green spaces in the city.					
<u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> Other reductions in supplies & services budgets within Parks & Green Spaces.					
<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Service Reduction					
<u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u> This relates to reductions in machinery and equipment purchase and maintenance budgets and is largely linked to the reduction in staffing levels within the service and consequently will have, in itself, minimal impact on service delivery.					
<u>Date of earliest implementation/ date of proposed implementation</u> Date: 1 st April 2011					
<u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u>		<u>2010-11</u> £000s	<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					
Non Staff Costs	2,015	0	70		70
Income					
Net Total	2,015	0	70		70
Staffing Implications		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
Current service staffing (FTE)					
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current vacancies (FTE)					
Individuals at risk (FTE)					

Environmental Services

ES22 Reductions in P&GS supplies and services budgets

Equality Impact Assessment

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.
	No negative impact.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the questions following the template.
	Not applicable.
Gender equality	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender?
	No negative impact.
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) and not by non-disabled people?
	No negative impact.
Community Cohesion	Will the proposal negatively impact on the Council achieving its community cohesion priorities: helping communities integrate in our outer estates; and building cohesion between different groups of young people in the city, and between young people and adults?
	No negative impact.