

# HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT (SUPPORTING PEOPLE) FUND

## DRAFT BUDGET STRATEGY

2011/12 – 2013/14

### CONTENTS

Section 1	Supporting People Summary	Page 2-9
Section 2	Risk Analysis	10
Section 3	Equality Impact Assessment Summary	11-13
Section 4	Summary List of Growth & Reduction Items	14
Section 5	Growth Proformas	15-16
Section 6	Reduction Proformas	17-30
Section 7	EIA Proformas	31-45

## **1.1 Purpose of Report**

1.1.1 This reports sets out the actions required to make reductions of 15% in year 1 and 7.5% in years 2 and 3 for services funded from the former Supporting People grant.

## **1.2. Summary**

1.2.1 The original Supporting People funding was originally a ring fenced grant to provide housing related support, which all statutory agencies could use to improve support for people with mental health problems, learning difficulties, substance misuse problems, ex offenders and homeless people.

1.2.2 The administration of the grant was originally overseen by the Supporting People Commissioning Board made up of the key partners. This Board has now been disbanded and in future decision relating to the commissioning of housing related support will be made by the multi-agency statutory Health and Wellbeing Board, which is in the process of being set up. Meantime an internal Delivery Group consisting of Divisional Directors who have internal or commissioned services funded from the monies will make recommendations to Cabinet where decisions are needed, pending the implementation of the Health & Well Being Board.

1.2.3 The ring fence for the Supporting People funding was removed on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010, although the Department Communities and Local Government (DCLG), still dictated how the grant would be spent. However, with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011, all conditions have been removed and the monies will form part of the Revenue Support Grant awarded to the Council.

1.2.4 This report sets out the proposals to achieve the housing related support savings in line with wider local authority funding reductions and identifies key actions needed in order to achieve the required reductions in 2011/2012. Further work is required to identify savings for year 2 & 3.

1.2.5 The recommendations contained within this report are not duplicated in any of the divisional budget proposals.

## **1.3. Report**

1.3.1 Housing Related Support currently funds a range of in-house and externally commissioned services for people with housing related support needs.

1.3.2 The current budget allocation for 2010/11 is £13,713,000, following the Comprehensive Spending Review announcements, the reductions of funds have been modelled on achieving savings of 15% in year 1 and 7.5% in years 2 and 3 (detailed in fig 1).

	2010/11	2011/12 (Year 1)	2012/13 (Year 2)	2013/14 (Year 3)
<b>Income</b>	13,713,000	11,656,050	10,627,575	9,599,100
<b>Target Percentage Reduction</b>	N/A	15%	7.5%	7.5%
<b>Overall Required</b>	N/A	<b>2,056,950</b>	<b>1,028,475</b>	<b>1,028,475</b>

(Figure 1)

1.3.3 To achieve these reductions the Delivery Group met to agree a shared and co-ordinated approach to support the decision making process across divisions. This resulted in a desk top evaluation of all services using the following principles:

- Application of corporate commissioning principles
- Review of the evidence base on the impact on outcomes
- Analysis of risk and direct and indirect impact
- Identification of reduction opportunities through improved procurement and price negotiation
- Incorporation of existing business intelligence and market position based on previous cost reductions

1.3.4 Alongside this, a prioritisation process was applied to all services based on a broader set of principles (**see appendix A**), the result of which can be applied if further efficiencies are required. Consideration was also given to the inter related impact on individual divisional budget reduction proposals to identify where double counting or impact/risk might be greater as a result of divisional proposals and strategies. An example of this was to ensure alignment with the ASC 3 year strategy where a significant shift to prevention and early intervention and associated re-design programme needs to be aligned with future housing related support requirements.

1.3.5 As a result of this exercise Cabinet are recommended to agree and support the proposals to achieve the required savings in year 1 (see section 4).

A) To support the procurement of homeless services, following a strategic review to enable efficiencies to be realised from the second quarter of 2011/12. The review identified the types of services that needed to be commissioned, and those that were no longer required. This includes the need to reduce the number of hostel places in the City, as there was found to be an over supply with up to 25% of the residents circulating around the system, whereas people should be supported to gain independent accommodation and supported to move on asap.

On 24<sup>th</sup> May 2010 a Single Access Referral (SAR) point was introduced, with access only being given to City Council hostels 123 bed spaces via the Housing Options service to ensure people are eligible, appropriately placed and are supported to move on. On average only 30% of people placed were statutory homeless cases and the remainder were homeless and needed support. The largest group were ex-offenders. No cases were found to be rough sleeping as a result of being refused entry via the SAR.

The Council's hostels are introducing Pathway Planning from 1/1/2011, which focuses support on getting people out of hostels and into independent living. This will result in more efficient use of hostel bedspaces and increase capacity. The strategic review envisaged this could allow some bedspaces to be closed including the internal hostels at Upper Tichbourne Street in year 1 and Lower Hastings Street in year 2. However, In view of the uncertainty around levels of single homelessness in the coming months it is proposed to continue to run Upper Tichbourne Street using Homelessness Grant funds.

Three voluntary sector hostel providers have joined the SAR scheme, with more to be included in 2011 and a growth bid has been proposed to enable this service to be extended (see attached SPG1). Prior to the SAR, there was evidence that the districts would refer people with high needs to the City's hostels to access other services, such as mental health support.

B) To negotiate a 15% reduction to contract values for services outside of the procurement exercise implemented from April 2011 to achieve the necessary year 1 savings.

Discussions have already taken place with external providers who are aware of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) and therefore are generally expecting budgetary reductions to their contracts. If negotiations fail to result in the required reductions then action could be taken to terminate the contract and re-procured as required. Due to the changes required by the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011, there may be a risk to the full year's savings not being achieved if the contracts cannot be reduced in time.

1.3.6 This approach takes into account the range of exercises that have been applied historically meaning efficiencies are likely to be manageable in different sectors as detailed in figure 2. (see base budget reduction proformas - section 6).

	2010/11	2011/12 (Year 1)	2012/13 (Year 2) cumulative	2013/14 (Year 3)
Divisional Director	Current spend	Proposed saving	Proposed	Proposed
Housing	6,544,984  (made up of internal and external services)	630,586 (internal services)  389,765 (externally contracted services)	1,290,351	
Community Safety	2,025,849	314,190  (externally contracted services)	399,190	
ASC	4,627,974	227,714 (internal services)	821,123	

		393,409 (externally contracted services)		
CYPS	507,117	15,866 (internal services)  20,241 (externally contracted services)	86,107	
Misc	282,096	5,451	55,451	
<b>Growth (SPG1)</b>	<b>SAR Development</b>	<b>(100,000)</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,713,000</b>	<b>1,897,222</b>	<b>2,652,222</b>	

Figure 2

1.3.7 The impact of the CSR on wider council services and the budget reduction exercise undertaken within divisions will be included in the Prevention and Intervention Strategy. This will encompass housing related support, which is one of the key elements to enable people to remain independent in their own home, and therefore potentially reduce the cost on other services, such as homelessness, adult social care and health. The strategy will also form a critical part of delivering the budget reductions and priorities for years 2 and 3.

1.3.8 For the majority of the services affected by the above proposals, the contracts end on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011. Therefore a waiver will be required to extend contracts to allow time for new contracts to be implemented and the strategic review to be completed.

1.3.9 The Housing Related Support Team has historically been part funded by the Council as well as a Government Administration Grant. The Government Grant was withdrawn in April 2010 and the loss has been absorbed through non-replacement of staff.

#### 1.4. Consultation

1.4.1 Consultation has been undertaken with the Divisional Directors affected who services are affected by the reductions, and they are in agreement to the proposals outlined in this report and were asked to brief their Lead Cabinet Member on the implications.

1.4.2 An outline of the CSR was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 & 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.

1.4.3 Members of the former Supporting People Commissioning Body, which has now been disbanded, are also aware of the overall reductions required, although they have not been briefed on specific reductions at this time.

Individual meetings will need to be arranged with the external stakeholders as soon as possible to share the overall nature of the proposals.

**1.5. Financial, Legal & Climate Change Implications**

**Financial (Rod Pearson, Head of Finance, Ext 29 8800)**

- 1.5.1 Supporting People was originally ring fenced and then became part of the wider Area Based Grant. From next year it will be received through Revenue Support Grant.
- 1.5.2 Work around making savings was done in the belief that there would be a need to make 30% savings across the next three years with 15% being required in year 1 and 7.5% in each of the next two years. Thus proposals for making £1.897m of savings in year 1 are included in this report. This will reduce the budget in 2011/12 to £11,816,000.
- 1.5.3 Further work is required to find the additional savings required for years 2 and 3.

**1.6. Legal (Joanna Bunting, Head of Commercial and Property Law, Ext 29 6450)**

1.6.1 The efficiency proposals comprise:

- (1) Continuing the competitive re-procurement of the homelessness related support (and therefore curtailing the extension of contracts on current terms).
- (2) Re-provisioning off Frameworks at a lower volume when current orders expire on 31 March 2011.
- (3) Negotiating lower price/volume arrangements with non Framework suppliers.

A legal risk assessment should be undertaken against (1) public law issues (such as the existence of any legitimate expectation of future supply and (2) procurement risk in negotiating changed contracts

It is also recommended that an Equalities Impact Assessment be undertaken.

**1.7. Climate Change (Helen Lansdown, Senior Environmental Consultant (Sustainable Procurement Ext: 29 6770)**

1.7.1 This report does not contain any significant climate change implications and therefore should not have a detrimental effect on the Council's climate change targets.

Equal Opportunities	Yes	See attached EIA proformas
OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	Paragraph References
Policy	Yes	Within Supporting information
		Procurement rules

		corporate/EU
Sustainable and Environmental	<b>No</b>	
Crime and Disorder	<b>No</b>	
Human Rights Act	<b>No</b>	
Elderly/People on Low Income	<b>No</b>	
Corporate Parenting duties	<b>No</b>	

Each funded service has been scored against a range of key headings to support a prioritisation process.

Consideration	Explanation	Scoring details where applied
Statutory Responsibility	There is no statutory responsibility to provide HRS services. However, there are certain client groups that have close links to supporting a statutory duty. These links have been noted.	1 point per statutory link
Cap Gemini Cost Benefit Tool	The cost benefit has been calculated per service (based on the overall client group the tool calculates)	0 = negative benefits 1 = £0- £10k 2 = £10k – £20k 3 = £20k+
Other Funding	Notes wider funding going into the service. For the purpose of this exercise it has been considered a risk to the wider funding and therefore the service should the HRS element be withdrawn/reduced.	1 = If other funding contributions
Strategic Links	Acknowledges each service's links to wider strategies/plans.	0 = No known links 1 = An inferred reference 2 = A strong referenced
Risk to Customers	Applied directly from the prioritisation process within the SP 5-year strategy that evaluated the risk to customers (to themselves or them to the wider public), by client group should a service be reduced/withdrawn.	0 = Low or No 1 = Medium 3 = High
Consideration	Explanation	Scoring details where applied
Equality Impact/Inclusion	All services have been recorded as having a potential equality impact should there be any service change/reduction given due to the breadth of vulnerable clients served.	N/A



Contract Implication	Notes the current contract/agreement end date.	N/A
Service usage	Highlights the average utilisation (usage) of services based on provider performance indicator returns.	N/A
Regional Benchmarking	Highlights the comparison of regional v Leicester weekly unit cost by service.	N/A
Service Outcomes	Information not considered (as yet) due to issues with the data collection	N/A

Please note that the measurement of need is a key component within any prioritisation process. However, until updated needs data is determined by the proposed accelerated strategy development there is the basic assumption that all services are needed in line with previous strategic reviews / contract management visits.

## **Section 2. Risk Analysis**

### **Budget Reductions:**

The provision of Housing Related Supported services are not a statutory requirement and therefore the local authority is not required to provide them. However, they do enable people to maintain independence in the community and prevent tenancy failure and homelessness.

A range of proposals have been put forward in order to ensure that there is not an over commitment of funds during 2011/12 onwards, as the monies to the Council reduce. This includes the re-procurement of some services and the reduction of contract values for others. Market testing and discussions with provider's shows that contracts can be reduced, whilst service levels are generally maintained.


Ultimately the Council has the option not to procure services if the contract reductions cannot be made or to terminate or vary existing contracts if necessary.

### Section 3. Overarching Housing Related Support Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> From client record data completed by the majority of housing related support schemes in March 2010 suggests that schemes are utilised by all sections of the communities represented in Leicester City. There are however significant variances between communities.  There are a number of Black & Minority Ethnic specific housing related support services that will be affected by this exercise directly. Negotiations will take place with these providers seeking efficiencies in the same way as non BME schemes.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> To ensure schemes are positively promoting their services for all communities they are required to fulfil the Fair Access Diversity & Inclusion element of the Quality Framework applicable to this market. This framework requires the service to apply a range of practices in relation to equality.  It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  N/A
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> From client record data completed by the majority of housing related support schemes in March 2010 suggests that schemes are utilised by 49%/51% female/male clients respectively.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> The above statistics imply fair access us being given to both

	<p>genders. The aforementioned Quality Framework will again ensure that schemes are positively promoting their services in relation to both genders.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
<b>Disability equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>See above.</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>See above.</p>

**Ethnic composition of the population by ward**



## Section 4. Summary of Growth and Reduction Items

### Budget Growth & Reduction Proposals - Commissioning & Business Support Division

		2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000
	<b>Growth Proposals</b>			
SPG1	Development of the Single Access & Referral Service	100	100	100
	<b>Total Growth</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>Reduction Proposals</b>			
SPR1	DV service 15% efficiencies	(20)		
SPR3	Homeless Procurement efficiencies	(683)		
SPR4	Sheltered Housing 15% efficiencies	(138)		
SPR5	Supported Housing 15% efficiencies	(460)		
SPR6	STAR service 15% efficiencies	(350)		
SPR7	General Prevention FS (external) 15% efficiencies	(15)		
SPR8	Cease funding for Upper Tichborne Street Hostel	(332)		
	<b>Total Reductions</b>	<b>(1,998)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Net Growth (Reduction)</b>	<b>(1,898)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

## Section 5. Budget Growth Proposals

### Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12

<b>SERVICE AREA: <i>Single Access &amp; Referral Point</i></b>	<b>Proposal No: SPG1</b>			
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b></p> <p>A Strategic Review of Homeless Services was undertaken during 2009-10. Recommendations included the introduction of a Single Access &amp; referral (SAR) as an integral part of a New Homeless Pathway in Leicester City. The SAR has been set up in Housing Options to effectively manage the assessment and placement of homeless people in LCC hostels.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Service Improvement				
<b><u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
<p>The pilot SAR in operation to date has been successfully managing referrals into LCC hostels with positive results in driving efficiencies alongside more appropriate placements in hostel provision. The extension of the SAR will support this arrangement to take place for externally funded hostel places and fully commit to the recommendations of the strategic review.</p>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				Date: <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	2011-12 £000s	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b><i>Effects of Changes on budget</i></b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs				

Income				
<b>Net Total</b>	0	100	100	100
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<i>Current service staffing (FTE)</i>				
<i>Extra post(s) (FTE)</i>		2	2	2



## Section 6. Budget Reduction Proposals

### Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12

<b>SERVICE AREA: Domestic Violence</b>				<b>Proposal No: SPR1</b>													
<b>Purpose of Service</b> The Housing Related Support ABG (previously Supporting People) funded a range of services for adults with housing related support needs. Service types include accommodation based and floating support services (including community alarms)																	
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="6"> <b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>            Specific efficiency reductions to one particular service that provides floating support to women at risk of domestic violence. This service to date has not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value.            An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.         </td> </tr> </table>						<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Specific efficiency reductions to one particular service that provides floating support to women at risk of domestic violence. This service to date has not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value. An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7 <sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 & 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.											
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Specific efficiency reductions to one particular service that provides floating support to women at risk of domestic violence. This service to date has not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value. An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7 <sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 & 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.																	
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>																	
Efficiency																	
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>																	
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="6">Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6">The key performance indicator for the service is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living.</td> </tr> </table>						Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications.						The key performance indicator for the service is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living.					
Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications.																	
The key performance indicator for the service is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living.																	
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>																	
					Date:	01/04/2011											
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>				<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>										
				<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>										
<b><i>Effects of Changes on budget</i></b>																	
				<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>												
Staff																	

Non Staff Costs				
Income				
<b>Net Total</b> (*current full year contract expenditure)	133,333*	20,000		
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		Note		
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		Non-LCC		
Current vacancies (FTE)		Staff		
Individuals at risk (FTE)				

**Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b><i>SERVICE AREA: Homelessness</i></b>		<b>Proposal No: SPR3</b>	
<b><i>Purpose of Service</i></b>			
<p>The introduction of the new homeless pathway was proposed following an evidence-based strategic review of homeless services.</p> <p>The re-commencement of the procurement of the homeless pathway supports the new structure being implemented whilst achieving considerable savings.</p>			
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>			
<p>The exercise is due to achieve efficiencies of 683,474 on externally contracted services. Due to the postponement and some required changes to the procurement documentation savings will only begin to be realised part-way through the 2011/12 financial year and thereafter. The proposed efficiency therefore reflects a 9mth saving.</p> <p>An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p>			
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Efficiency			
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>			
<p>The new Homeless Pathway introduces a new structure to Leicester's homeless services providing a clearer access route through a single access &amp; referral point and a clearer pathway thereafter. This subjects the external services to competitive tender and drives the required efficiencies/market shaping whilst retaining the level of service required.</p> <p>The key performance indicator for these services is NI141: % service users who have moved on in a planned way.</p>			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>			
		<b>Date:</b>	<input type="text" value="01/07/2011"/>
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13 £000s</u></b>
<b><i>Effects of Changes on budget</i></b>			
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>	

Staff				
Non Staff Costs				
Income				
<b>Net Total</b> (*current full-year contract expenditure)	3,456,858*	683,474	50,000	0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<i>Current service staffing (FTE)</i>		<i>Note</i>		
<i>Post(s) deleted (FTE)</i>		<i>Non-LCC</i>		
<i>Current vacancies (FTE)</i>		<i>Staff</i>		
<i>Individuals at risk (FTE)</i>				

**Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA: Sheltered Housing Provision for Housing Related Support Services</b>		<b>Proposal No: SPR4</b>			
<b>Purpose of Service</b> The Housing Related Support ABG (previously Supporting People) funded a range of services for adults with housing related support needs. Service types include accommodation based and floating support services (including community alarms)					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Sheltered Housing - Long-term services to date have not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value.</p> <p>An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Sheltered Housing - Long-term services to date have not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value.</p> <p>An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p>
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Sheltered Housing - Long-term services to date have not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value.</p> <p>An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p>					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Efficiency					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications.</p> <p>The key performance indicator for these services is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living – to date services have consistently achieved the targets set.</p> <p>These schemes are made up of both LCC &amp; external organisations.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p>Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications.</p> <p>The key performance indicator for these services is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living – to date services have consistently achieved the targets set.</p> <p>These schemes are made up of both LCC &amp; external organisations.</p>
<p>Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications.</p> <p>The key performance indicator for these services is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living – to date services have consistently achieved the targets set.</p> <p>These schemes are made up of both LCC &amp; external organisations.</p>					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="01/04/2011"/>	
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14 £000s</u></b>	
<b><i>Effects of Changes on budget</i></b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income					

<b>Net Total</b> (*current full year contract expenditure)	917,253*	137,588		0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<i>Current service staffing (FTE)</i>		2		
<i>Post(s) deleted (FTE)</i>		2		
<i>Current vacancies (FTE)</i>				
<i>Individuals at risk (FTE)</i>		2		

**Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA: Supported Housing and Floating Support (LD, MH, Phys/Dis)</b>		<b>Proposal No: SPR5</b>			
<b>Purpose of Service</b> The Housing Related Support ABG (previously Supporting People) funded a range of services for adults with housing related support needs. Service types include accommodation based and floating support services (including community alarms)					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Supported Housing and Floating Support (Learning Disabilities, Mental Health &amp; Learning Difficulties - Long-term services to date have not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value.</p> <p>An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Supported Housing and Floating Support (Learning Disabilities, Mental Health &amp; Learning Difficulties - Long-term services to date have not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value.</p> <p>An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p>
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> Supported Housing and Floating Support (Learning Disabilities, Mental Health &amp; Learning Difficulties - Long-term services to date have not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value.</p> <p>An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p>					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Efficiency					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications. Please note that Adult Social Care have had successful negotiations with the same providers to reduce the cost of the care element of customer packages.</p> <p>The key performance indicator for these services is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living – to date services have consistently achieved the targets set.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p>Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications. Please note that Adult Social Care have had successful negotiations with the same providers to reduce the cost of the care element of customer packages.</p> <p>The key performance indicator for these services is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living – to date services have consistently achieved the targets set.</p>
<p>Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications. Please note that Adult Social Care have had successful negotiations with the same providers to reduce the cost of the care element of customer packages.</p> <p>The key performance indicator for these services is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living – to date services have consistently achieved the targets set.</p>					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="01/04/2011"/>	
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	
<b><i>Effects of Changes on budget</i></b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income					

<b>Net Total</b> (*current full year contract expenditure)	3,064,713*	459,707		0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<i>Current service staffing (FTE)</i>		<i>Note</i>		
<i>Post(s) deleted (FTE)</i>		<i>Non-LCC</i>		
<i>Current vacancies (FTE)</i>		<i>Staff</i>		
<i>Individuals at risk (FTE)</i>				



**Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA STAR</b>		<b>Proposal No: SPR6</b>			
<b>Purpose of Service</b>					
<p><b>STAR</b> (Supporting Residents And Tenants) offers short term, one to one support at home for vulnerable tenants who may be at risk of losing their homes through debt, ill health , chaotic life styles, inability to cope. STAR supports families, single people and older people, gypsies and travellers, and people with substance use issues, who have been homeless, or who are likely to become homeless without support. STAR is contracted to work with 730 vulnerable people at any one time, and supports over 1200 people. p/a</p>					
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>					
<p>The proposal is to reduce the service expenditure by 15% / 350k. This equates to reducing the staffing establishment by 13.5 staff, 13 of these currently hold temporary contracts. None of the STAR offices will close but operating hours will be reduced. An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p>					
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</b>					
Service Reduction / Efficiency					
<b>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</b>					
<p>Will be a reduction of 120 cases supported at any given time resulting in approximately a reduction of 225 cases per year. The key performance indicator for the service is <b>NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living</b>. The STAR service achieved 99.28% success rate 09/10. There may be impacts on other service areas if people fail to keep their tenancies (for example Adults Social care , CYPS, Crime and Disorder , and Health and Well-being )</p>					
<b>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</b>					
Date: 1/4/2011					
<b>Financial Implications of Proposal</b>		<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income					

<b>Net Total SP grant aid</b>	2.330,514	350		
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<i>Current service staffing (FTE)</i> 70		56.5		
<i>Post(s) deleted (FTE)</i>		13.5		
<i>Current vacancies (FTE)</i> 12.5				
<i>Individuals at risk (FTE)</i> .5				

**Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA: External Floating Support (General Prevention)</b>		<b>Proposal No: SPR7</b>			
<b>Purpose of Service</b>					
<p>The Housing Related Support ABG (previously Supporting People) funded a range of services for adults with housing related support needs. These include services for young people at risk, adults with disabilities, older persons and offenders, amongst others. Service types include accommodation based and floating support services (including community alarms)</p>					
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>					
<p>External Floating Support Services have not been asked directly to consider a 15 % reduction on their current contract value. Therefore there is a need to negotiate a 15% reduction on the 11/12 contract value</p> <p>An outline of the Comprehensive Spending Review was presented to the Housing Related Support Provider Forum on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, in terms of a 15% reduction in year 1, followed by a 7.5% cut in year 2 &amp; 3. Generally, those present accepted that there would be a reduction in the contract values and were open to negotiations to reduce costs.</p>					
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</b>					
Efficiency					
<b>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</b>					
<p>Negotiations with providers will determine whether they can achieve a 15% efficiency without or minimal service implications.</p> <p>The key performance indicator for these services is NI142- Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living – to date services have consistently achieved the targets set.</p>					
<b>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</b>					
				Date: 01/04/2011	
<b>Financial Implications of Proposal</b>		<b>2010-11 £000s</b>	<b>2011-12 £000s</b>	<b>2012-13 £000s</b>	<b>2013-14 £000s</b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs					
Income					

<b>Net Total</b> (*current full year contract expenditure)	98,240*	14,736		0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<i>Current service staffing (FTE)</i>		<i>Note</i>		
<i>Post(s) deleted (FTE)</i>		<i>Non-LCC</i>		
<i>Current vacancies (FTE)</i>		<i>Staff</i>		
<i>Individuals at risk (FTE)</i>				

**Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> <i>Hostels</i>		<b>Proposal No: SPR8</b>	
<b>Purpose of Service</b>			
The Council runs 4 short stay hostels which, provide in total 128 bed spaces for single people and couples who are found to be homeless and have support needs.			
<b>Proposal</b>			
Cease funding to Upper Tichbourne Street Hostel			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Service Reduction/efficiency			
<b>Service Implications</b>			
<p>The Strategic Review of Homelessness Services suggested that less hostel bed spaces are needed in Leicester. New working practices have been introduced within the Housing Strategy and Options Division to make more efficient use of the Council's own hostels. The work includes better targeting of who is offered accommodation and in- hostel support which focuses on move-on. The aim is to reduce people's length of stay to that which is appropriate.</p> <p>All access to Council's hostels is now through Housing Options. As part of the budget proposals a full Single Access and Referral point (SAR) will be set up in Housing Options and all voluntary sector hostels will be required to refer their vacancies to this, including 140 assessment and progress bed spaces for homeless single people. It is expected that effective management across both the council and voluntary sector hostels will reduce the overall need for homeless hostel bed spaces to achieve the desired savings.</p> <p>However in the current economic climate it is difficult to predict future demand pressures. It is therefore proposed to fund Upper Tichbourne hostel through the homeless grant to provide a safety net during a time of uncertainty about the future levels of single homelessness in the City (See Housing Strategy and Options budget proposal G3)</p>			
<b>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</b>			
Date: 1/4/2011			
<b>Financial Implications of Proposal</b>		<u>2010-11</u> <u>£000s</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>£000s</u>
			<u>2012-13</u> <u>£000s</u>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>			
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>	
Staff			
Non Staff Costs			
Income			

<b>Net Total from SP</b>	<b>Grant aid</b>	332	332	332
<b>Staffing Implications</b>			<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>
<i>Current service staffing (FTE)</i>				
<i>Post(s) deleted (FTE)</i>				
<i>Current vacancies (FTE) (agency, secondment and temp appointments )</i>				
<i>Individuals at risk (FTE)</i>				

## Section 7. Equality Impact Assessment Proformas


### Budget Equality Impact Assessment Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care Efficiency Saving Proposals Homeless Pathway Procurement Exercise SP G1

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  The strategic review of homelessness services clearly evidenced the need to develop a single access and referral point (SAR) , which followed extensive consultation with a broad range of stakeholders. The SAR model has been developed to provide homeless customers with a route through homelessness services via a clear and structured Pathway of support. This will enable homeless people to build skills for independent living via a structured Pathway of support.  The SAR will deliver co-ordinated access to homeless services providing priority access to City residents in a much more planned and co-ordinated manner.  A full EIA of the introduction of a new homeless pathway was completed in November 2009, which explored the impacts/risks via a full consultation exercise and sought to minimise negative impacts where possible.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  The aforementioned EIA resulted in no negative impact being identified in relation to race equality.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  N/A
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>

	As per Race Equality.
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The aforementioned EIA resulted in no negative impact being identified in relation to gender equality.</p>
<b>Disability equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>As per Race Equality.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The aforementioned EIA identified an action to ensure that at least one project in each stage of the Pathway has wheelchair access.</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>As per Race Equality.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The aforementioned EIA resulted in no negative impact being identified in relation to community cohesion.</p>



## Ethnic composition of the population by ward




**Budget Equality Impact Assessment  
Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
Efficiency Saving Proposals  
Housing Related Support Domestic Violence Services SP R1**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  This scheme is specifically procured to deliver a domestic violence service to women from a range of Black & Minority Ethnic Communities.  As noted in other EIA's for housing related support contact will be made directly with the affected service. Negotiations will take place with these providers seeking efficiencies in the same way as non BME schemes.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  To ensure schemes are positively promoting their services for all communities they are required to fulfil the Fair Access Diversity & Inclusion element of the Quality Framework applicable to this market. This framework requires the service to apply a range of practices in relation to equality.  It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  N/A
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  Due to the nature of this service this is a women only scheme and therefore will only affect women.

	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The aforementioned Quality Framework will again ensure that schemes are positively promoting their services.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
<b>Disability equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>See above.</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>See above.</p>

## Ethnic composition of the population by ward




**Budget Equality Impact Assessment  
Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
Efficiency Saving Proposals  
Homeless Pathway SP R3**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  The strategic review of homelessness services clearly evidenced the need to develop a homeless pathway, which followed extensive consultation with a broad range of stakeholders.  The new Homeless Pathway introduces a new structure to Leicester's homeless services providing a clearer access route through a single access & referral point and a clearer pathway thereafter.  This will enable homeless people to build skills for independent living via a structured Pathway of support. The pathway will deliver co-ordinated access to homeless services providing priority access to City residents in a much more planned and co-ordinated manner.  A full EIA of the introduction of a new homeless pathway was completed in November 2009, which explored the impacts/risks via a full consultation exercise and sought to minimise negative impacts where possible.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	The aforementioned EIA resulted in no negative impact being identified in relation to race equality.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  N/A	
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?

	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b></p> <p>As per Race Equality.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The aforementioned EIA resulted in no negative impact being identified in relation to gender equality.</p>
<b>Disability equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>As per Race Equality.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The aforementioned EIA identified an action to ensure that at least one project in each stage of the Pathway has wheelchair access.</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>As per Race Equality.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The aforementioned EIA resulted in no negative impact being identified in relation to community cohesion.</p>

## Ethnic composition of the population by ward




**Budget Equality Impact Assessment  
Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
Efficiency Saving Proposals  
Housing Related Support for  
Sheltered Housing SP R4**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  From client record data completed by the majority of housing related support schemes in March 2010 suggests that schemes are utilised by all sections of the communities represented in Leicester City. There are however significant variances between communities.  There are a number of Black & Minority Ethnic specific housing related support services that will be affected by this exercise directly. Negotiations will take place with these providers seeking efficiencies in the same way as non BME schemes.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  To ensure schemes are positively promoting their services for all communities they are required to fulfil the Fair Access Diversity & Inclusion element of the Quality Framework applicable to this market. This framework requires the service to apply a range of practices in relation to equality.  It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? <b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  N/A
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>



	<p>From client record data completed by the majority of housing related support schemes in March 2010 suggests that schemes are utilised by 49%/51% female/male clients respectively.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The above statistics imply fair access us being given to both genders. The aforementioned Quality Framework will again ensure that schemes are positively promoting their services in relation to both genders.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
<b>Disability equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>See above.</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>See above.</p>

## Ethnic composition of the population by ward



**Budget Equality Impact Assessment  
 Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care  
 Efficiency Saving Proposals  
 Housing Related Support Supported Housing and Floating  
 Support Services SP R5,6,7**

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  From client record data completed by the majority of housing related support schemes in March 2010 suggests that schemes are utilised by all sections of the communities represented in Leicester City. There are however significant variances between communities.  There are a number of Black & Minority Ethnic specific housing related support services that will be affected by this exercise directly. Negotiations will take place with these providers seeking efficiencies in the same way as non BME schemes.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>  To ensure schemes are positively promoting their services for all communities they are required to fulfil the Fair Access Diversity & Inclusion element of the Quality Framework applicable to this market. This framework requires the service to apply a range of practices in relation to equality.  It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? <b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>  N/A
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b>

	<p>From client record data completed by the majority of housing related support schemes in March 2010 suggests that schemes are utilised by 49%/51% female/male clients respectively.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The above statistics imply fair access us being given to both genders. The aforementioned Quality Framework will again ensure that schemes are positively promoting their services in relation to both genders.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
<p><b>Disability equality</b></p>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>See above.</p>
<p><b>Community Cohesion</b></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><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed efficiencies will be realised in negotiation with providers with minimal, if any, reduction in actual service. At the point that any negotiations show otherwise a review of any equality impact will be required.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>See above.</p>

## Ethnic composition of the population by ward

