

# Cabinet

## DOCUMENTS FOR THE MEMBERS ROOM

Wednesday, 18th November,  
2015 at 10.00 am

MEMBERS ROOM DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO THE  
LISTED REPORTS

### Contacts

Cabinet Administrator

Judy Cordell

Tel: 023 8083 2766

Email: [judy.cordell@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:judy.cordell@southampton.gov.uk)

# MEMBERS ROOM DOCUMENTS

**10 SOUTHAMPTON FAIRNESS COMMISSION REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS** (Pages 1 - 46)

Final Report.

**14 GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET 2016/17 TO 2018/19** □ (Pages 47 - 96)

Individual draft ESIA documents.

**15 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT REVENUE BUDGET 2016/17 TO 2018/19** □  
(Pages 97 - 120)

Individual draft ESIA documents.

Tuesday, 10 November  
2015

HEAD OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

# **A Fairer Southampton**

**Southampton Fairness Commission**

**Final Report: December 2015**

DRAFT

## Contents

1. Acknowledgements
2. Foreword from the Chair
3. Our vision and principles
4. Executive summary and recommendations
5. The Southampton Fairness Commission
6. Why fairness is important for everyone
7. The Southampton picture – not such a fair deal for everyone
8. Consultation, participation and engagement
9. The Commission's recommendations:
  - Fairer employment
  - Fairer living
  - Fairer organisations
  - Fairer communities
10. A fairness index for the city
11. Next steps

Appendix 1: Speakers and facilitators

## 1. Acknowledgements

The Southampton Fairness Commission would like to thank:

- The countless individuals, groups, organisations who invested their time and energy in contributing to the Commission's work – there are too many to name individually
- Those who shared their knowledge and expertise
- Those who gave us their personal testimonials and life experiences
- Those who shared their enthusiasm, innovation and ideas
- Speakers who gave formal presentations at the themed meetings.
- Other Fairness Commissions that have inspired us.

We would also like to thank people who spoke and gave their support at the initial launch of the Southampton Fairness Commission - Lela Kogbara (Islington Council) John Denham (MP for Southampton Itchen until May 2015) and Paula Claisse from KPMG.

We would particularly like to thank Councillor Andy Hull (Islington Council) for sharing learning and experience of the first ever Fairness Commission with us.

Find out more about the Southampton Fairness Commission by visiting our website:  
[www.southamptonfairnesscommission.org](http://www.southamptonfairnesscommission.org)

## 2. Foreword from the Chair

Like everyone else, I want a good life for myself, my family, and my friends. I want a roof over my head, food and shelter for my family, good health, a chance to learn and develop, and hold a satisfying position in a community which makes me feel wanted and useful. A world in which everyone had all this would come close to my personal definition of fairness.

I have worked in Southampton for 17 years and been closely involved in many of the economic and social developments in the city. I have been fortunate in having a rewarding job and a circle of stimulating and helpful colleagues. Not everyone has been that lucky.

Outside London, the South East is the most prosperous region in the world's sixth largest economy. Southampton is the region's second largest city. It includes one of Europe's largest cruise ports and the UK's second largest container terminal. It is home to two universities, many large, successful and growing companies, the regional headquarters of many major financial services providers, and is one of the UK's most popular retail centres.

Yet it also contains pockets of extreme social and economic exclusion. The Index of Multiple Deprivation (2015), has just been released. This shows that Southampton is becoming more deprived compared to other places in the country. Within the city, of the 148 neighbourhoods analysed (Lower Super Output Areas/ LSOA's), Southampton contains 19 in the most deprived 10% in England. Almost 70% of LSOAs are more deprived in both absolute and relative terms compared with IMD (2010). This is so much more than a statistic. It means people sleeping rough on the streets, not knowing where their next meal is coming from. It means adults and children living in sub-standard housing. It means children going to school without a proper meal. It means people being marginalised from society and from the labour market. It means generations of children growing up with low aspirations, and little hope. It means people dying early because of the postcode they were born into, or live in.

This is not primarily a report about equality and diversity, though clearly they are inextricably intertwined with issues of fairness. Underlying all of our recommendations is the absolute necessity for people to be protected from discrimination and prejudice. We believe that the effect of our proposals will be to promote equality, reduce the harmful effects of irrational prejudice, and encourage Southampton to celebrate and benefit from the rich diversity of its inhabitants.

We in the Southampton Fairness Commission believe that:

- **Inequality is bad for everybody**, not just those at the lower end of the socio-economic scale. Numerous recent studies by leading economists bear this out.
- **Inequality is growing in the UK** and has been growing for the last ten years, accelerating after the 2008 economic crash and recession.

- **Concerted local action is required** and likely to be the only effective way forward. Disadvantaged people in Southampton and other similar communities are unlikely to receive any significant help from public agencies over the next few years because of policy constraints in central government and resource constraints in local government.
- **Southampton has the potential to be one of the best places in the world to live and work.**

Southampton has sometimes been criticised for a lack of ambition, a feeling that although things could be better, they are not bad enough to spur energetic action. But the social indicators in the UK, and global economic trends, are moving in the wrong direction. We can either wait until they compel crisis action, or seize the initiative now and bring public, private, and non-profit sectors, (corporate and individual), together to make the most effective use of the resources available to make the city a better place to live, work, learn, visit, and do business.

**Jonathan Cheshire OBE**

### **3. Our vision and principles**

One of the greatest challenges for the city is how to tackle unfairness and improve outcomes for those experiencing disadvantage, whilst maintaining the levels of wellbeing others already enjoy.

#### **Our vision of fairness**

A fairer Southampton will have a virtuous circle, centred upon fairness and a reduction in inequalities, with more and more of our citizens contributing economically and socially, thus generating further economic prosperity and a greater sense of collective wellbeing. We want everyone, irrespective of social or financial status to be able to:

- Reach their full potential.
- Live in good quality, affordable homes.
- Lead healthy, active and independent lives.
- Contribute fully to the life of the city.

#### **Our principles of fairness**

- Everyone in Southampton should have the opportunity to do well in life, regardless of their beginnings or where they live.
- A commitment to greater equality in health outcomes, wellbeing, social relationships, learning and life opportunities, is a worthwhile investment for all, reducing costs and multiplying social and economic benefits in the long term.
- Consensus and innovation among Southampton's public, private and voluntary sectors should bring about lasting solutions to inequality.
- Prevention of inequalities and removing any barriers to fairness through appropriate policy and practice are more effective than later attempts to correct unfairness.
- People are empowered more when solutions are found by them in consultation with others, not just for them.
- Resources should be prioritised where the most benefit can be provided for those in greatest need.
- Southampton must reflect, represent and cherish our community diversity, value those from different backgrounds and identities, and protect and encourage vulnerable people.



## 4. Executive summary and recommendations

This report presents a summary of our findings and the 13 key recommendations of the Southampton Fairness Commission.

In undertaking this work, we have engaged with a wide cross-section of contributors and used a range of methods to gather evidence, inform our priorities and test our recommendations.

We have considered the wider structural issues and made a conscious decision to focus on those areas where we can make the biggest difference at a local level.

The Chancellor's Summer Budget recently announced many reforms to welfare including 'in-work' benefits and a new national Living Wage. The impact on fairness and on individuals, households and employers is currently being debated.

The Commission have also considered the 'Localism Agenda'. In particular, we looked at how greater use can be made of powers, duties, and resources to get the best and fairest outcomes for residents.

Locally our expectation is that our recommendations will be considered by the City Council when seeking greater local influence, freedoms and flexibilities through devolution. A combined authority submission could be instrumental in making the sub-region and Southampton fairer.

The Commissioners want:

- The recommendations in this report to help build consensus in the city to address the imbalances detailed in section 7 and make us a fairer city.
- The leaders of public, private and voluntary sectors to ensure, when making difficult decisions, they are fair and do not inadvertently foster inequality.
- Southampton Connect<sup>1</sup>, the City Council and key organisations to influence outcomes, by using their resources, powers and voice in a cohesive and unified way to campaign regionally and nationally for better outcomes for Southampton residents.

Our recommendations have been reached through consensus and based on the evidence we have gathered. In presenting them, we have focused on those that will really make a difference to fairness in Southampton. There is much good work already under way in the city to improve the lives of those who are most under-served and disadvantaged, which we have assumed will continue. We have not prioritised areas where we have little new to add.

---

<sup>1</sup> Southampton Connect comprises leaders from the public, private and voluntary sectors and is chaired by the Chief Executive of Southampton City Council. Representation includes health, universities, colleges, schools, police, probation, fire service, Southampton Voluntary Services, Chamber of Commerce and Business South.

Our recommendations are given below:

### **Fairer employment**

1. Create a 'Great Place to Work' city with commitment from employers, including the promotion of the Living Wage<sup>2</sup> and recognise achievements at an annual award ceremony.
2. Establish a comprehensive support service designed to help people deal with involuntary self-employment, fairly and safely - e.g. dealing successfully with HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC), insurance, cash flow, credit control and VAT.
3. Establish a tactical fund to address urgent skills shortages in the local labour market; to be allocated by a representative group of employers and employee representatives, to be financed by pooled contributions from strategic funders – Skills Funding Agency (SFA), Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and their contracted providers.

### **Fairer living**

4. Increase the availability of affordable and good quality housing by using alternative funding mechanisms outside public sector constraints to build new homes and exploit under-used resources such as empty properties, self-build and container conversions. This should also provide local employment opportunities.
5. Encourage our citizens to take individual responsibility for healthier lifestyles and all agencies to take collective action to support this through citywide campaigns to reduce smoking, drinking and obesity.
6. All health and social care commissioners should ensure that contracts with providers require them to demonstrate that they have taken action to achieve equity of outcomes. The Health and Wellbeing Board must monitor inequalities and take actions to address them.
7. Improve access to, and awareness of financial services for all by building capacity in community finance institutions and initiatives e.g. Credit Unions and user-friendly local banking.
8. Improve the ability of people to manage money better by:
  - a. Promoting and providing learning modules for debt and money management in schools and colleges.

---

<sup>2</sup> Living Wage in this report refers to the level recommended jointly by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Resolution Foundation, which may be higher than the Living Wage in the Chancellor's Summer Budget 2015.

- b. Developing and implementing a programme to increase awareness of and fair access to welfare entitlements, particularly linked to key life-transition points.
9. Improve accessibility to integrated transport by actively:
- a. Supporting social enterprise solutions to improve local transport, particularly in non-commercial routes.
  - b. Taking a more strategic approach to market failures in transport, particularly bus routes and frequency of key bus services.

The delivery of the recommendations under these two themes needs to be supported by:

### **Fairer organisations and fairer communities**

10. Organisations, in procuring goods and services, should maximise local economic and social outcomes through improved application of the Social Value Act to:
- a. Increase employment and skills of local residents.
  - b. Use local supply chains to develop capacity in local organisations with a long term commitment to the city.
11. Promote zero tolerance of bullying, hate crime and discrimination, by increasing awareness in the city of reporting mechanisms and organisations improving their responses and support for victims.
12. Support individuals and communities to take responsibility for improving the quality of their lives and their environment through funding of small community-run preventative projects to reduce inequality.
13. Set up a 'Southampton Fairness Fund', an 'employee giving' scheme matched by employers and allocated in a transparent and democratic way by an independent voluntary sector organisation to promote fairness.

## 5. The Southampton Fairness Commission

The Southampton Fairness Commission is an independent and entirely voluntary body. It was set up in late 2013, against a backdrop of impressive economic growth for the city that is somewhat negated by the poverty and deprivation experienced by a significant proportion of its citizens. It was established by Southampton City Council to look into how to make the city a fairer and more equal place to live and work, by:

- Identifying inequalities and challenges in the city and developing a strategic approach to fairness and equality.
- Improving understanding of fairness and equality, through the examination of the key thematic priorities.
- Setting forward a vision for fairness that would inform, influence and inspire Southampton City Council and partner organisations.
- Identifying and examining ways partner organisations can work together to develop innovative responses.
- Collecting examples of good practice in order to develop evidence-based policy recommendations and responses to promote equality and fairness through the work of Southampton City Council and partner organisations.
- Informing and influencing budgetary decisions proposed by Southampton City Council.
- Influencing corporate and civic behaviour of others in the city.

### **The Commissioners:**

The Southampton Fairness Commission comprises representatives from the public, private, and voluntary sectors. The Commissioners are unpaid volunteers and were appointed as a Task and Finish Group on the basis of their professional expertise and commitment to fairness and social justice. They have shaped and promoted the work of the Southampton Fairness Commission, and worked together to identify practical ways of making the city a fairer place.

The Commission is chaired by Jonathan Cheshire OBE, a leading developer of charities and voluntary agencies with particular expertise in youth and young people's issues, employment and training, regeneration, and outdoor education.

The Vice Chair is Dr Darren Paffey, a former Labour councillor for Southampton City Council and a lecturer in Spanish and Linguistics at Southampton University.

The Commissioners are:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Experience/ Areas of Interest/ Expertise</b>
Dave Adcock	EU Welcome Project – supporting local migrants
Jo Ash	Southampton Voluntary Services – voluntary sector
Annette Davis	SCRATCH - Community led anti-poverty projects
David Gilani	University of Southampton - Student experience, communications
Geoff Glover	Ford Motor Company Ltd (previously) - employment, skills and business development
Joe Hannigan	Southampton and Hampshire Trades Councils, Health and Care Activist
Ian Loynes	SPECTRUM Centre for Independent Living – Disability issues
Ahmed Sasso MBE	Southampton police lead on diversity matters
Jojar Singh	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
Alex Whitfield	Solent NHS Trust – senior management experience in health

As a Commission, we have considered the wider structural issues and made a conscious decision to focus on those areas where we can make the biggest difference at a local level.

## 6. Why fairness is important for everyone

Fairness is important for everyone. The '*Spirit Level*'<sup>3</sup> and '*Fair Society, Healthy Lives*'<sup>4</sup> (Marmot Review) provide compelling evidence that unfairness and greater levels of inequalities in society correspond to poorer outcomes on a whole range of indicators from child wellbeing, right through to life expectancy and life's end.

There will be some who have no direct experience of inequality, and who will think that an unfair Southampton is nothing to do with them. They would be wrong; unemployment, poor educational achievement, low incomes, poverty, health inequalities and discrimination prevent people from achieving their full potential, reduce their contribution to wider economic growth, and inhibit the city's ability to attract public funds and inward investment.

An excellent start to life sets the right foundation for all children to grow into confident, successful and active citizens. Barriers such as poor schooling, poverty, domestic violence and ill health can result in children not being able to develop fully and make their full contribution to the local economy and the communities to which they belong. People whose life chances and health are damaged because of where they are born, their circumstances or their background, are likely to need more support from services paid for by council taxpayers and by those in work. The Government estimates that for every family with complex needs, who are successfully supported by a range of services to turn their lives around, the total public sector savings are in the region of £96,000 per year.<sup>5</sup>

Social cohesion is damaged when people feel they have no stake in their communities or are alienated by poverty and unemployment. Helping everyone to realise their full economic and social potential means fewer people will be unemployed or be dependent on benefits and public services. This will ultimately have a greater positive impact on the city through their increased economic output and more local spending. This will create a positive cycle of generating job opportunities to the benefit of local people, so that our residents can also contribute towards the growth of the city. There is a strong and undisputable economic and social case that reducing the large disparities between the 'haves' and 'have-nots' in the city will ultimately make life better for all.

We want more employers, talent and wealth creators, to be attracted to invest in the city. One sustainable way to do this would be to tackle unfairness and the social conditions that strain public resources and make for a less welcoming environment.

---

<sup>3</sup> Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2010). *The Spirit Level: Why Equality Is Better For Everyone*. Penguin.

<sup>4</sup> *Fair Society, Healthier Lives: The Marmot Review* (2009). Institute of Health Equity.

<sup>5</sup> *The Cost of Troubled Families* (January 2013). Department of Communities and Local Government.

## 7. The Southampton picture – not such a fair deal for everyone

Southampton is the one of the largest cities in the South East and has huge economic potential. It was identified as the 4<sup>th</sup> highest ranked city for ‘good growth’<sup>6</sup> in the UK in 2013. However not all local people enjoy the benefits. There are huge differences in life chances, experiences and outcomes between our more affluent residents, neighbourhoods and communities and the most deprived, as well as between some areas in the city and regional or national averages.

The Index of Multiple Deprivation (2015), has just been released and we are awaiting the detailed analysis. It shows that Southampton is becoming more deprived compared to other places in the country. Within the city, of the 148 neighbourhoods analysed (Lower Super Output Areas/ LSOA’s), Southampton contains 19 in the most deprived 10% in England. Almost 70% of LSOAs are more deprived in both absolute and relative terms compared with IMD (2010).

We considered a lot of data as well as feedback about people’s own experiences relating to poverty, inequality and fairness. We found evidence that not everyone in the city gets a fair deal.

For example:

- The best-paid jobs in the city are held by in-commuters. In 2014, the average gross weekly pay by residence was £487.40 per week compared to £547.00 by workplace.<sup>7</sup>
- The average annual gross earnings of resident workers in Southampton was £24,913 in 2014. This is lower than for England at £27,500 and the South East at £29,903.<sup>8</sup>
- There are higher unemployment rates amongst over 50s in Southampton (4.3%) compared to England and the South East (3.5% and 3% respectively).<sup>9</sup>
- Benefit Sanctions for Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA) claimants are particularly prevalent in Southampton. The local job centre is in the top three in UK for highest use of sanctions<sup>10</sup> with 11.9 sanctions per 100 claimants in March 2014. Only Test Valley and Richmondshire have higher rates at 12% and 15.4 respectively.
- Resident skills levels are below national average for higher level skills. The percentage of residents qualified to NVQ Level 4 or above is 34.4% compared to 35.7% for England and 39.1% for the South East.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Price, Waterhouse, Cooper (2013). *Good Growth for Cities: A Report on Economic Wellbeing in UK Urban Areas*.

<sup>7</sup> NOMIS (2014). Official Labour Market Statistics. *Labour Market Profile – Southampton*. [Online]. Available from: [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk). Accessed August 2015.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid

<sup>9</sup> Annual Population Survey (2015) Data from April 2014 – March 2015. [Online]. Available from: [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk). Accessed August 2015.

<sup>10</sup> Beaty, C. et al (March 2015). *Benefit Sanctions and Homelessness: A Scoping Report*. Available from: [www.crisis.org.uk](http://www.crisis.org.uk). Accessed August 2015.

<sup>11</sup> Annual Population Survey (2015) Data from April 2014 – March 2015. [Online]. Available from:

- Nearly a quarter of children (9,830) live in poverty in the city and this figure rises to almost 40% in one of our most deprived wards.<sup>12</sup>
- The education attainment gap at GCSE for children eligible for free school meals is significant. 31.7% achieve 5 A-C GCSEs compared to 55.2% for children not eligible.<sup>13</sup>
- The proportion of working age Housing Benefit claimants has increased from 13% in April 2009 to 18% in April 2015.<sup>14</sup>
- The city has a lower rate of owner occupation than the regional and national average: 49.7% compared to 67.6% for the South East and 63.3% nationally. This is linked to the high level of students we have in the city (around 47,000).
- It has a higher rate of private rented (24.9% compared to 16.3% for the South East and 16.8% nationally) and a higher rate of social rented (23.3% compared to 13.7% for the South East and 17.7% nationally).<sup>15</sup>
- There are significant health inequalities in the city. People die earlier in the most deprived areas of Southampton – men by 6.7 years and women by 3.2 years.<sup>16</sup> In Year 6, 21.8% of children are classified as obese,<sup>17</sup> a higher rate than the national average.
- The rate of smoking related deaths was 329.2 per 100,000 people (2011-13 pooled). This is set to rise as the estimated levels of adult smoking in Southampton are worse than the England average.
- According to the IMD 2010,<sup>18</sup> income deprivation is a major factor affecting older people in Southampton, with seven geographical areas in the city falling in the worst 10% for England. Low income in retirement is often linked to earlier low pay, or time out of employment – for example, due to caring responsibilities, disability or unemployment.<sup>19</sup>

Making Southampton a fairer city means changing these disparities by improving aspects of life that matter most to people.

---

www.nomisweb.co.uk. Accessed August 2015.

<sup>12</sup> Children in Low Income Families. (2014) HMRC. Data from Snapshot August 2012. [Online]. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/personal-tax-credits-children-in-low-income-families-local-measure-2012-snapshot-as-at-31-august-2012>. Accessed August 2015.

<sup>13</sup> Local Authority Interactive Tool (LAIT) 2014 [Online]. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-authority-interactive-tool-lait> Accessed August 2015.

<sup>14</sup> Southampton Welfare Reforms Monitoring Group (2015). *Local Impact of Welfare Reforms 2014-2015*.

<sup>15</sup> Census 2011. Office of National Statistics [Online] <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/census/2011/>

<sup>16</sup> 2011-2013 pooled data.

<sup>17</sup> 2013/2014 data.

<sup>18</sup> Gamblin, D. and Mead, V. (May 2011). *Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2010*. [Online]. Available from: <http://www.southampton.gov.uk/policies/IMD2010%20Full%20Report%20May%202011.pdf> Accessed August 2015.

<sup>19</sup> Age UK (2015) *Living on Low Income in Later Life*. [Online]. Available from: <http://www.ageuk.org.uk/money-matters/income-and-tax/living-on-a-low-income-in-later-life/> Accessed August 2015.



Poverty in employment is a growing issue. Vulnerability to, and experience of poverty differs significantly. Key poverty triggers are usually life events such as unemployment or a reduction in, or loss of earnings, retirement, the onset of a disability or ill-health and changes in the household (for example, more children, becoming a lone parent, divorce and separation, bereavement).

Income is massively important – the difference between the highest and lowest earners creates social distance, impacts on self-esteem, status and value, corrodes social cohesion and social mobility and generally results in poorer outcomes. At a local level, addressing poverty and low incomes is central to achieving fairness and therefore, has been the focus of the Southampton Fairness Commission's work. Hence many of our recommendations concentrate on skills improvement and employability so that people can raise their income levels, and on encouraging the development of jobs - at or above the Living Wage. We also emphasise increasing income by ensuring take-up of welfare entitlements and other support, and by promoting financial inclusion.

Crucially, some national policies impact on income and inequality. Austerity, alongside increases in the cost of living, and reductions in public sector funding, may have increased the risk of poverty and inequality and compounded the effects of economic deprivation.

Some of those hardest hit by the government imposed welfare changes have been those living in geographically deprived areas, women, young people, households with a disabled person, and families with larger numbers of children. Nationally, the biggest financial losses to benefit claimants arise from reforms to incapacity benefits (£4.3bn a year), changes to Tax Credits (£3.6bn a year) and the 1 per cent up-rating of most working-age benefits (£3.4bn a year).<sup>20</sup>

In July 2015, the Chancellor published his Summer Budget. Although we have not yet been able to fully assess the local implications, we welcome and support:

- The introduction of a new National Living Wage for people aged 25 and over.
- The proposed creation of 3 million new apprenticeships by 2020.
- The proposal to offer 30 hours of free childcare to working families with 3 and 4 year olds from September 2017.

While we are aware that further changes to welfare provision will have wide reaching implications for people on low incomes, we want local decision-makers to consider the following elements of the Summer Budget which we feel may have a detrimental impact on many local people:

---

<sup>20</sup> Beaty, C & Fothergill, S. (April 2013). *Hitting the Poorest Places Hardest: The Local and Regional Impact of Welfare Reform*. Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research Sheffield Hallam University. [Online]. Available from: [http://www.shu.ac.uk/research/cresr/sites/shu.ac.uk/files/hitting-poorest-places-hardest\\_0.pdf](http://www.shu.ac.uk/research/cresr/sites/shu.ac.uk/files/hitting-poorest-places-hardest_0.pdf) Accessed August 2015.
















- Freezing of working-age benefits, including Tax Credits and Local Housing Allowances for 4 years from 2016 - 2017.
- Reducing the household benefit cap from £26,000 to £20,000 and the income thresholds for Tax Credits and Universal Credit.
- Removing the automatic entitlement to housing support for new claims in Universal Credit from 18 - 21 year olds who are out of work. We do not endorse age discrimination as housing costs are the same, whatever your age.
- Requiring tenants living in social housing who have a family income of £30,000 to pay market, or near market rate, rents.

We are also concerned about:

- The new National Living Wage not applying to under 25 year olds.
- The potential for confusion between the 'real' Living Wage and the new National Living Wage.

DRAFT

Measuring an improvement in fairness is difficult. We have selected a few measures to illustrate disparities within a prosperous city in the South East.

Theme	Indicator	Baseline	City – Most Recent (2015)	City Trend	Regional	National	Source
Employment	Long term unemployment Rate per 1,000 aged 16-64	1.68% (2004)	4.5%		3.62%	7.1%	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) 2014
	Key out of work benefit claimants	10.9% (2004)	9.1%		6.8%	9.7%	DWP 2014
Income	Earnings by residence (gross weekly wage)	£397.9 (2004)	£487.40		£567	£520.8	DWP 2014
	Earnings by workplace (gross weekly wage)	£429.7 (2004)	£547		£541.4	£520.2	DWP 2014
	Child poverty (in under 16s) % of children under 16, in families receiving means-tested benefits & low income.	28.4% (2007)	23.5%		14.9%	19.2%	Public Health 2012
Health	Smoking prevalence	32.4% (2000-02)	21.5%		17.24%	18.4%	Public Health 2013
	Obese adults	21.5% (2000-02)	25.1%		21.05%	23%	Active People Survey, Public Health 2012
Housing	Statutory homelessness Rate per 1,000 households	4.9% (2005 – 06)	1.7%		1.63%	2.3%	Public Health 2013/14
Growing Up	Obese children % school children in yr6 (age 10-11)	17.2% (2005 - 06)	21.8%		16.43%	19.1%	Public Health 2013/14
	Infant mortality rate Rate per 1,000 live births	3.2% (2003 – 05)	2.6%		3.34%	4.0%	Public Health 2011-13
	NEET (Academic age 16 – 18 not in education, employment or training)	6.3% (2012)	4.8%		4.2%	4.7%	Department for Education 2014
	GCSE achieved (5 A*-C incl. Eng. And Maths)	36.2% (2005 – 06)	51.0%		59.03%	56.6%	Department for Education 2013/14
Growing Older	<b>Life expectancy</b>						
	Males	76.5 (2003 – 05)	78.2		80.4	79.4	Public Health 2011-13
	Females	81.2 (2003 – 05)	82.7		83.9	83.1	Public Health 2011-13
	Excess winter deaths Ratio of winter deaths to average non winter deaths	18.2% (2004 – 07)	19.1%		18.14%	17.4%	Public Health 2010 -13

## **8. Consultation, participation and engagement**

The work of the Southampton Fairness Commission has drawn on local consultation, participation and engagement as well as the extensive body of evidence about the nature and extent of inequality in the UK and the damaging effects of inequality on wider society.

We have used a range of methods to gather evidence, inform our priorities and test our recommendations.

We used a range of methods including: collection and analysis of ‘fairness’ data, (and commissioning additional research where we have found gaps), visiting local groups, undertaking face to face interviews and surveys, attending discussions, debates and events and holding a series of public meetings covering key themes.

We have engaged with community representatives and advocates, local agencies and specialist workers, experts and academics and most importantly – knowledgeable residents of Southampton.

We thank all those who have participated.

A summary of this work is available on the Southampton Fairness Commission website.

## 9. The Commission's recommendations:

In making our recommendations, we have grouped them into 2 key themes:

**Theme 1: Fairer employment:** lack of and access to credit, difficulty getting work, access to skills, zero hours contracts, involuntary self-employment, low pay, limited chances of career progression.

**Theme 2: Fairer living:** lack of housing, poor housing, affordability of housing, health, obesity, social isolation, mental health, dementia, older people, growing up, affordable, transport, buses, digital divide.

The delivery of recommendations within these two themes needs to be supported by:

**Fairer organisations:** DWP, customer services, access to services, need for support.

**Fairer communities:** Valuing our local voluntary sector, community resilience, co-design and delivery, support services, and working together to tackle discrimination, harassment and hate crime.

For each recommendation, we have:

- Provided a sample of quotations from the wide-ranging feedback we received and tried to show a balance to reflect the range of feedback we received on the main issues.
- Given the rationale and impact of the recommendation and the difference it will make if implemented.
- Identified key organisations to be involved in delivering it.

***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- *We need to “market Southampton to encourage more employers into the city.”*
- *“Share job opportunities between Southampton, Portsmouth and Hampshire as all are in easy commuting distance.”*
- *“Work with employers to raise awareness of the barriers.”*
- *“Employers need to invest in people.”*
- *“There is a lot of pressure on the salaries of workers in the city and employment has become more insecure.”*
- *“Parents returning to work, salary decreases, need more opportunities for work that fits in with parents’ responsibilities. This could be part of kite marking.”*

**Fairer employment:  
Making work really pay**

**Recommendation**

1. **Create a ‘Great Place to Work’ city with commitment from employers, including the promotion of the Living Wage and recognise achievements at an annual award ceremony.**

A ‘Great Place to Work’ Employment Charter would look to embed in the workplace leading-edge approaches to work, resulting in employees feeling engaged with their employer and their employment. Employees would be consulted and involved in planning facilities, flexible working arrangements (particularly for those with caring responsibilities) and wellbeing initiatives. Support for Corporate Social Responsibility and volunteering schemes would also help to meet the needs of both employees and employers. Increasingly, employers are recognising that paying a real ‘Living Wage’ is essential to employee engagement and high levels of productivity – and workforce development and career advancement are key in employee retention.

Recognition for employers leading the way on ‘Great Place to Work’ would be at a high profile annual awards ceremony. Embedded within this, will be the recognition of agencies who have demonstrated zero tolerance of bullying, discrimination and hate crime, for example by increasing awareness of this amongst staff, encouraging reporting of incidences and improving their ability to respond to support victims. (See also Recommendation 11).

**Why have we made this recommendation?**

Southampton has higher than average levels of economic growth and a better employment rate than the UK average. We estimate that there are 18,600 full-time workers in the city who earn £7.69 or less.<sup>21</sup> (The current Living Wage outside

<sup>21</sup> Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2014). [Online]. Available from: [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk). Accessed

London is £7.85). It has seen a significant reduction in the number of people claiming Jobseekers Allowance and been very successful in reducing the number of young people Not in Employment, Education and Training (NEETs).

Despite these positive features and trends, Southampton is a low wage economy with a continuing local shortage of the skills needed by employers and in line with national trends, low productivity levels. A disproportionate number of low-paid jobs are done by local people while many out-of-city commuters travel in for higher-paid jobs. Many local people are being forced to travel further for work and low wages have led to a growing use of food banks by people in employment. While the city benefits greatly from a large student population, this also impacts on the ability of residents to gain entry-level jobs. Employment patterns and barriers to work cause and maintain inequalities. Finally, the cost of childcare prohibits people returning to work.

Support towards childcare cost under Working Tax Credit/Universal Credit can only be claimed if the provider is on a HMRC approved childcare scheme (defined as being registered by Ofsted or directly run by a school/academy).

### **What difference will it make?**

This recommendation will build on the efforts in the city to further improve educational attainment in schools and colleges, increase the number of apprenticeships, traineeships and reduce the number of young people who are not in education, employment and training as well as enabling adults to enter and progress in employment. It focuses on the quality of the working environment, work and a fair remuneration. Employers who have embraced the 'A Great Place to Work' approach have seen improvements in motivation and productivity and a reduction in employee sickness and absence rates.

We identify Southampton Connect, Business South and Hampshire Chamber of Commerce as key in delivering this.

#### ***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- *"The jobs that are available aren't suitable for many people."*
- *"We need good information about how to maintain and increase income as people come off benefits and into work (in one example a man went from 3 days a week to 5 days a week and lost £400 a month)."*
- *"We need a 'watchdog' of local recruitment agencies to stop people getting 1 or 2 days' work."*

August 2015

#### **Recommendation 2:**

**Establish a comprehensive support service designed to help people deal with involuntary self-employment fairly and safely - e.g. dealing successfully with HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC), insurance, cash flow, credit control and VAT.**

## Why have we made this recommendation?

The labour market and the nature of employment is changing dramatically, largely driven by these competitive pressures and constantly advancing technologies. Nationally, there has been an increase in self-employment. The picture locally is less clear. While the city's continued economic growth has led to job creation, not all local residents have benefited from this because:

- Many vacancies are advertised without a salary and are often close to the minimum wage or on zero hours.
- There has been a growth of low paid, insecure employment – zero hours, 'self-employment', and involuntary short time.

There is convincing anecdotal evidence about the numbers of people being coerced into involuntary self-employment by employers who do not want to be responsible for National Insurance, sick pay, pensions, paid leave, or minimum wage levels. The interaction between the benefit system and self-employed income is particularly problematic. Concerns have been raised that Universal Credit will bring new burdens for self-employed people - *'as they will have to report their income on a monthly basis rather than annually through HMRC - and - many will receive less support than employees earning the same amount, just because what they take home varies from month to month'*.<sup>22</sup>

The analysis from the Resolution Foundation is salutary:

*'For some, higher self-employment levels are an indication that the recovery is built on shaky ground. There are suspicions that many of the newly self-employed are there unwillingly, forced to go it alone due either to a lack of employee jobs or unscrupulous employers looking to minimise their liabilities. There are also claims that people who may previously have remained unemployed have been encouraged to register as self-employed to access tax credits, but without the skills or desire to do so. Seen through this lens, self-employment represents another kind of precarious work, in the same vein as zero-hours contracts, leaving many with little security and few employment rights.'*

*For those who choose it, self-employment can be a challenging but highly rewarding endeavour. But self-employment also brings with it disadvantages, additional struggles and unpredictability. In addition, a range of protections — from basic employment rights to financial security, such as inclusion in auto-enrolment pension schemes — which most employees will enjoy are not*

---

<sup>22</sup> David Finch (June 2015). The Resolution Foundation <http://www.resolutionfoundation.org/media/press-releases/universal-credit-red-tape-cull-needed-to-help-parents-and-sole-traders/>



*available to those working for themselves. As a result, it is important that self-employment should be a genuine choice, not a last resort'.<sup>23</sup>*

### **What difference will it make?**

The establishment of a comprehensive support service would fill a gap in local provision for people who are forced into self-employment for jobs and in many cases, low paid jobs. People in these circumstances will be better able to establish themselves as self-employed and be more confident of navigating some of the complexities, risks and liabilities of self-employment.

We identify local advice and information services as key in delivering this.

#### ***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- *“Training and development for people in work so they can move up for better jobs.”*
- *“Look at barriers to different age groups – e.g. education/qualifications, computers, reading & writing.”*
- *“Training and funding for all – not just the youth.”*
- *“Apprenticeships for all ages and abilities.”*
- *“In-house learning and development needs to be encouraged by employers who need to remember that training is an investment not a cost.”*
- *“There have recently been some challenges recruiting the right staff, so we have developed greater flexible working and apprentice schemes.”*

#### **Recommendation 3:**

**Establish a tactical fund to address urgent skills shortages in the local labour market; to be allocated by a representative group of employers and employee representatives, to be financed by pooled contributions from strategic funders – Skills Funding Agency (SFA), Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and their contracted providers.**

Locally, there is a talent mismatch, i.e. the skills of people available for employment do not match well with opportunities available for locally for employment. The result is unfilled vacancies, stalled business growth, persistent unemployment amongst some sections of the population, under-utilisation of skills, frustrated aspirations, unfulfilled lives and an increased demand upon welfare provision.

---

<sup>23</sup>D’Arcy, C. & Gardiner, L. (May 2015). *Just the Job – or a working compromise?* The Resolution Foundation. [Online]. Available from: <http://resolutionfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Just-the-job-or-a-working-compromise.pdf> Accessed August 2015.

## **Why have we made this recommendation?**

The Southampton labour market, like the wider UK, is full of contradictions. Unemployment is still high (and rising once again), but employers are worrying about their ability to fill vacancies and secure the requisite skills for business growth. We need to develop skills for the future and yet many employees are in positions well-below their competence level and feel under-utilised at work. Local people are struggling to secure jobs in the local economy, yet local employers are hiring people from other parts of the UK or overseas to fill vacancies.

The demand for advanced, senior and specialist skills is not met by the local skills supply. There is a healthy demand for lower-skilled workers, but in many cases far outweighed by supply, with as many as 60 applicants for some low-skilled vacancies. Many middle-level posts are disappearing, due to the application of technology or re-organisations, which eliminate, outsource or offshore these jobs.

Resident levels of higher level skills (NVQ Level 4 - degree equivalent and above) are below South East and national average.<sup>24</sup> Workers from intermediary roles are applying for and securing lower level positions. This includes graduates, who are finding it difficult to find graduate positions and so, in many cases, are adding to the competition for middle and lower level positions.

Labour is moving into the city from elsewhere, challenging city residents for the positions available at all levels. Fierce competition for jobs at the middle and lower end of the job spectrum is suppressing wages, whilst at the top end employers are suffering skills shortages, partially because these shortages exist, and partially because local residents are being sucked into the London economy and as a result pay is rising rapidly.

These conditions are causing twin tracks in pay and job security in the city. One track provides job insecurity, casual employment and low wages, whilst the other offers job security, permanent employment and rapidly rising wages. This will exacerbate the gap between the haves and have-nots in the city, as well as being bad for economic development and community well-being.

Short-term and urgent skills shortages are not always remedied in time by strategic bodies such as the Skills Funding Agency and the Local Enterprise Partnership. We need the 'Quest for Talent' to become a 'Quest to develop Talent', in order to safeguard economic development and social cohesion.

## **What difference will it make?**

Barriers leading to local skills shortages can be given high priority and resolved effectively and quickly by employers using a tactical fund for operational issues. This will benefit both employers through timely identification and responses to local skills gaps. It will help residents by giving them training and job opportunities and improve their employability.

---

<sup>24</sup> The percentage of residents qualified to NVQ Level 4 or above is 34.4% compared to 35.7% for England and 39.1% for the South East.

We identify local employers and employee representatives, along with the Skills Funding Agency (SFA), Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and their contracted partners, as key in delivering this.

**Other recommendations for fairer employment:**

- Actions to improve pay ratios by increasing incomes and promoting the Living Wage in the city.
- Improve digital skills and employability of target groups and communities who are 'digitally excluded' by prioritising Community Learning budgets, alongside promoting digital inclusion and ensuring accessibility to public services.

DRAFT

### **Fairer living:**

#### ***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- *“Affordability is an absolutely key issue in terms of housing access and fairness”.*
- *“‘Silent Homelessness’ (sofa surfing, young families living with parents etc.) is an issue that goes unrecorded.”*
- *“People living in private sector rented accommodation face unfair impact of the fee structure of agencies which means they do not take people on benefits. Deposits are not always being returned in full and tenants are not appealing.”*
- *“No real control over landlords. Basic lack of health and safety – more regulation needed.”*
- *“Housing conditions /homelessness impacts profoundly both on health and education/ employment.”*
- *“Principle issues are around cold, damp and overcrowding – linked to avoidable death, fuel poverty, respiratory problems and family problems with stress and anxiety etc. Overcrowding means children have nowhere to study and do homework. No home means difficulty washing, keeping clean and fit for work / study.”*
- *“Rules on ‘making oneself homeless’ seem unfair for families / individuals. In order to qualify for help must be children, severely disabled, experiencing domestic violence, mental health.”*
- *“Solutions for people living in social rented sector accommodation include building more homes and considering other models”.*
- *“Repeal bedroom tax!”*

### **Recommendation 4: The home truths**

Increase the availability of affordable and good quality housing by using alternative funding mechanisms outside public sector constraints to build new homes and exploit under-used resources such as empty properties, self-build and container conversions. This should also provide local employment opportunities.

Housing quality and cost are a big issues nationally. If you are a private renter you are likely to spend a greater proportion of your income on housing than other tenure types. Data from 2014, identified that *‘at 55%, private renters in the bottom fifth of the income distribution spent the highest percentage of their income on housing costs. The next group was social renters in the bottom fifth at 33%’*.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> MacInnes, T. et al (November 2014). *Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion 2014*. Joseph Rowntree

## Why have we made this recommendation?

There are huge housing pressures in Southampton. The level of owner occupation is dramatically lower than that in the rest of the South East. This is not unrelated to issues of deprivation, particularly worklessness and low incomes, and is unusual in and otherwise prosperous region. In addition, people on limited incomes can find themselves priced out of more expensive housing in areas outside the city, causing them to move to Southampton out of economic necessity. This places even greater strain on the city's housing. Like the rest of the South East, Southampton's property prices continue to grow at a rate that puts home ownership out of reach of many residents. (The average house price is almost 7 times the average income in the city<sup>26</sup>)

The private rented sector has become a very useful source of meeting local housing needs and has grown to become one of the largest in the South East (24.9% compared to 16.3% for the South East and 16.8% nationally). Southampton is cited as a 'Buy to Let' hotspot, identified nationally as the city with the highest monthly return on investment.<sup>27</sup>

At the lower end of the private rented sector, there are issues around access, insecurity/length of tenure, quality and affordability. For a single young person working full-time on minimum wage, a one-bedroom house would take the equivalent of 80% of their income per week.<sup>28</sup>

Southampton has around 7000 Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). The national average proportion of private dwellings that are HMOs is 2%. For Southampton this is 9.3%, a higher HMO rate than Portsmouth (5.9%) and Bournemouth (7.3%) but the rate is less than that in Brighton and Hove (20%).<sup>29</sup> This higher rate, is in part, related to the number of students who chose to study in the city.

The demand for social housing in the city is extremely high, and waiting times for an affordable home can often be up to seven years. There were over 13,000 on Council's waiting list for housing in 2014.<sup>30</sup> With only 40-60 vacancies per week, it would mean an average wait of 300 weeks (i.e. a baby born at the start of the wait would be at school by the time this period elapsed).

Southampton is active in working on homelessness prevention. There has been a 50% increase in the number of recorded homelessness preventions from 2008 to 2013. In 2008 the number of households prevented from becoming homeless was 902, but five years later this increased to 1,486 cases (2013). Whilst homeless acceptances have increased nationally by 20% over the last four years, in

---

Foundation.

<sup>26</sup> Office National Statistics - average dwelling price in Southampton in 2014 was £170,000, average income was £24,913.

<sup>27</sup> HSBC (2014) [www.newsroom.hsbc.co.uk](http://www.newsroom.hsbc.co.uk)

<sup>28</sup> Love Southampton: Submission to Southampton Fairness Commission. [Online] Available from: <http://www.lovesouthampton.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/LS-Housing-Submission-to-Fairness-Commission-RELEASE.pdf> Accessed August 2015.

<sup>29</sup> *Housing and Health in Southampton* (July 2015). Report to Southampton Health and Wellbeing Board.

<sup>30</sup> 13,287 on waiting list 1 April 2014 (Local authority housing statistics data returns for 2013 to 2014 – Gov.uk)

Southampton this has been restricted to 10%. The number of individuals found rough sleeping on weekly outreach sessions was 8 in 2011/12 increasing to 9 in 2014/15.<sup>31</sup> Anecdotally, 'Silent Homelessness' (sofa surfing, adults and young families living with parents etc.) is also an issue which goes unrecorded.

Recent changes to the Housing Act 1985 (made by the Deregulation Act 2015) will reduce the qualifying period for a secure tenant to exercise the right to buy their property in England from five to three years. This could have a significant effect on local authorities as a large number of additional tenants will immediately be eligible for the right to buy.

The Summer Budget (July 2015) also included a range of announcements on housing, including:

- rents in the social housing sector to be reduced by 1% per year for the next 4 years
- tenants living in social housing who have a family income of £30,000 will be required to pay market, or near market, rate rents.
- measures to reduce tax reliefs which encourage 'buy to let' investments - with an aim to free up the housing market to more of the owner/occupier market including first time buyers.

None of the three changes above will increase housing supply, which is at the root of the problems in Southampton.

### **What difference will it make?**

Good quality homes in decent neighbourhoods enable people to live safe, healthy and happy lives.<sup>32</sup> Without a home, it is virtually impossible to get and sustain employment. This recommendation aims to increase the availability of affordable, good-quality housing in the short and long term and to provide local employment opportunities. It could be achieved by:

- Financing the building of new homes by the City Council.
- Enabling Housing Co-operatives to develop in the city.
- Developing creative short-term housing solutions, linked to developing skills and employment; e.g. high-spec container conversions and short-term leasing of empty properties for single people and young couples.
- Reinstating the private sector stock condition survey.
- Developing a register of landlords and a 'Good Landlord' quality mark/scheme and requiring all landlords and agencies to be on a register with the City Council.

We identify landlords (private sector and registered social) as key in delivering this.

In addition to recommendation 4, The Southampton Fairness Commission also recognises there are some groups facing specific and considerable issues relating to housing. In particular, it would like issues of unfairness in planning and

---

<sup>31</sup> *Housing and Health in Southampton* (July 2015) Health and Wellbeing Board.

<sup>32</sup> *Housing and Health in Southampton* (July 2015) Health and Wellbeing Board.

accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People tackled locally.

***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- *“Smoking is the biggest cause of health inequalities – employers could offer employees time off if they want to go to a quitting group.”*
- *“People should know what help was available. Easier for people who have internet access, but it is much more difficult for the poor, ill, disabled etc...”*
- *“I feel that there is no real understanding of the impact that these benefit changes are having on claimant’s lives and health. I am stuck in a downward spiral and [am] now in a deep, dark hole.”*
- *“The number of working adults in poverty is deeply unfair in my eyes as it can then result in mental health issues (and issues for children)!”*

**Recommendation 5:  
*Health is wealth***

**Encourage our citizens to take individual responsibility for healthier lifestyles and all agencies to take collective action to support this through citywide campaigns to reduce smoking, drinking and obesity.**

**Why have we made this recommendation?**

We recognise the importance of physical and mental health and well-being. Physical health is still under threat from the big killers – heart disease, stroke and cancer. Smoking is the biggest preventable cause of death in England and the primary reason for the gap in life expectancy between rich and poor in Southampton.

Anxiety, isolation and loneliness were common recurrent themes in the feedback we received. Mental health, according to recent population surveys, is not improving in Britain, despite the fact that we have become richer in the last 50 years.

Of course mental and physical health impact on each other, too: mind and body are one.

Individual choices play a part in this, and people can make great strides towards wellbeing by taking responsibility for their lifestyles. Regular exercise and sleep, moderation in eating and alcohol consumption, and quitting harmful addictions such as smoking are things we can all attempt. Some may even be able to grow their own fruit and vegetables, and cook fresh meals.

Beyond these basic changes, it can be useful to check that innate emotional needs are being met in a balanced way. When these needs are not met, or we are misusing our own resources such as imagination, we suffer from anxiety or anger, and eventually depression (for more information and a useful checklist, see 'human givens' at [www.hgi.org.uk](http://www.hgi.org.uk) ).

### **What difference will it make?**

When fundamental needs are met, people are freer of distress and able to flourish as part of a thriving community.

They have security within an environment that is safe for them and their family, and which affords some private time in which to reflect and consolidate their experiences. They have a sense of control over what happens around them and to them. They receive enough positive attention from others, and are able to give attention to others too. They are able to develop friendships and loving relationships, making emotional connections to others, and can enjoy taking part in social groups within the wider community. From such interactions they gain a sense of acceptance and feel valued for their contributions. They can decide on the personal goals that they really want to strive towards; when achieved, they gain a real sense of competence – the opposite of low self-esteem. Finally, they discover the purposes for which they are prepared to work unselfishly, whether for their family, for some service to the community, for learning, exploration or spiritual development, or some combination of these. This gives their lives meaning.

Barriers to such flourishing arise when the individual's environment is toxic in some way; when their innate 'guidance system' is not functioning well (perhaps due to damage or the effects of traumatic experiences); or when they have missed out on developing coping skills when growing up. It is in these areas that support for individuals is most obviously needed.

We identify health and community-based services as key in delivering support for individuals, through community development approaches that help people to help themselves.

#### ***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- *“Remove postcode lottery on medical treatment”.*
- *“There are gaps – when people are discharged from hospital, their benefits don't start straight away. Or when someone loses a job. Can take 2-3 weeks”.*
- *“Improve access and services for disabled people and carers”.*
- *“Improve access to information and advice at key stages and transitions in life”.*

### **Recommendation 6: Health is wealth**

**All health and social care commissioners should ensure that contracts with providers require them to demonstrate that they have taken action to**



**achieve equity of outcomes. The Health and Wellbeing Board must monitor inequalities and take actions to address them.**

### **Why have we made this recommendation?**

Health inequalities are largely preventable.<sup>33</sup> They arise from a complex interaction of the wider determinants of health - housing, income, education, social isolation, disability - all of which are strongly affected by individual economic and social status. Tackling these problems makes economic sense as well as being socially just. Inequalities in life expectancy are usually indicative of inequalities in health and wellbeing.

Health and social care commissioners should commission services with the aim of reducing inequalities. Currently the providers of these services, public, private and voluntary, make up some of the largest employers in the city and work with many of the most disadvantaged groups, but have little or no contractual obligation to demonstrate overall reduction in inequality as a result of the service.

A contracted requirement to reduce inequality, would oblige providers to be more creative in tackling the problem. It would drive implementation of the Living Wage, changes in accessibility to services, support into employment for people who find it hard to access work, upskilling of staff to help the most disadvantaged groups and employing a workforce reflective of the diversity of the service users, increasing the quality of the service. It would unleash a substantial amount of energy and focus on delivering a significant change to improve fairness. An annual report from each provider to the Health and Wellbeing Board will evidence the extent to which these commitments are delivered.

### **What difference will it make?**

When citizens need publicly funded services, the most disadvantaged citizens will find these easier to access. This will improve the use of health services and earlier intervention, leading to improved outcomes:

- Better health and functionality for those with long-term illnesses
- Increased life expectancy eventually

As significant employers in the city, there will be an impact on the employment outcomes:

- More Living Wage employers – leading to an increase in average wage for Southampton citizens

---

<sup>33</sup> Health Inequalities in Southampton (Nov 2014). Public Health Intelligence. [Online]. Available from: <http://www.publichealth.southampton.gov.uk/Images/Health%20Inequalities%20in%20Southampton%20-%20November%202014%20v5.pdf> Accessed August 2015.

- Easier employment for people from disadvantaged groups leading to fewer children living in poverty.

We identify Southampton's Health and Wellbeing Board, local Health and Social Care Commissioners, local providers/employers and community-based services as key in delivering this.

***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- "Every school leaver should have credit union account."
- "It's hard to put something away when money is so tight."
- "Sometimes I can make it last and end up having to borrow - I don't like doing this but I don't really have any choice."

**Recommendation 7:  
Every penny counts!**

**Improve access to, and awareness of financial services for all by building capacity in community finance institutions and initiatives e.g. credit unions and user-friendly local banking.**

**Why have we made this recommendation?**

Many people in the city struggle with money management skills and in accessing the banking and financial services they need.

Financial inclusion means everyone being able to use banks and other mainstream financial systems/services, regardless of their income. It is essential for anyone wanting to participate fairly and fully in everyday life. Without this, people pay more for goods and services and have less choice. The impacts of exclusion are not just financial but also affect education, employment, health, housing, and overall wellbeing.<sup>34</sup> Save the Children calls this the 'Poverty Premium'<sup>35</sup> and estimates its cost to be £1,639 a year – around 8% of income for families around the poverty line.<sup>36</sup>

This lack of access, at times coupled with limited knowledge of financial products and services and how to use them, is exploited by unscrupulous lenders, and can lead to high cost borrowing and deep debts.

Our view is that rather than saving solely in banks, large organisations should place some of their resources in credit unions so that these can scale up their operations. For example, credit unions in Scotland (i.e. Glasgow Credit Union) are large enough to be mortgage lenders. This recommendation is to encourage the development of

<sup>34</sup> <http://financialinclusioncommission.org.uk/facts>

<sup>35</sup> The Poverty Premium is the additional amount financially excluded household pay to borrow money, access credit to buy household items, pay more for home contents insurance and for utilities etc.

<sup>36</sup> Save the Children 2014: *A Fair Start for Every Child: We must act now to tackle child poverty in the UK.* [http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/sites/default/files/documents/a\\_fair\\_start\\_for\\_every\\_child.pdf](http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/sites/default/files/documents/a_fair_start_for_every_child.pdf)

large credit unions that can play a bigger role in offering financial services to people on low incomes and edge out the unscrupulous lenders in the city.

### **What difference will it make?**

It will build financial resilience through reliable and viable community finance institutions to provide an important access route to a range of tailored financial services. People who currently struggle to get a bank account or use unscrupulous money lenders will be able have a 'bank 'account and access affordable loan products and saving schemes. This in turn will help them improve their financial resilience, manage their money more effectively, reduce the risk of debt or the need to access high cost (legal and illegal) lending and reduce the impact of the 'poverty premium' where people on low income end up paying more. They will also not pay unreasonably high rates of interest on their loans and debts.

We identify community finance institutions and initiatives, alongside large organisations in Southampton as key in delivering this.

#### ***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- *“Young people heavily targeted by lifestyle marketing: phones, consumer goods, gaming and gambling games, apps, activities, payday loans, - it’s easy to get into debt.”*
- *“Friend has nervous breakdown, frightened about mortgage.”*
- *“JCP don’t help. Just lost job and been made homeless and told have to wait 6 weeks before getting any money.”*

### **Recommendation 8:**

**Improve the ability of people to manage money better by:**

**Promoting and providing learning modules for debt and money management in schools and colleges.**

**Developing and implementing a programme to increase awareness of, and fair access to, welfare entitlements, particularly linked to key life-transition points.**

### **Why have we made this recommendation?**

Many people (young and old - rich and poor) struggle to manage their money well. However, if you have less money, mistakes can be very costly. Being able to manage money well is a key life skill which we believe should be taught from an early age. We also believe this works best where there is access to appropriate financial products and services.

Key life transitions and living on a low income for a sustained period can lead to debt problems. Low-income households are vulnerable to debt issues and national

research<sup>37</sup> has shown that over-indebtedness is typically caused by persistently low income (both benefit and earnings-derived), and moving in and out of work, rather than the use of credit to acquire material goods and a higher standard of living.

The welfare system should be there to support people. According to research, almost a third of eligible people in the UK are not claiming the means-tested benefits they were entitled to.<sup>38</sup>

It is important that services are available to help people who are struggling to manage and that people are aware of and can access these services and the support available.

### What difference will this recommendation make?

Children and young people will be better able to budget and manage their money as adults. Improving take-up of means-tested benefits by those in and out of work would make a major contribution to poverty reduction. The increased income associated with greater take-up could also contribute to improvements in other outcomes, such as health, family well-being and employment participation and retention.<sup>39</sup> Those in difficulty will be able to find and access support. Those needing to claim welfare benefits for whatever reason, will have good, accurate information on what they are entitled to and how to claim. This will help to ensure an easy transition at key points in their lives.

We identify keyworkers, advice agencies, schools and colleges and the local Jobcentre Plus as key in delivering this.

#### ***This is what people told us during the consultation process.....***

- *“What about out of hours? There are also issues around trying to get around the city once the buses have stopped running - an example was given by a member of the public who had to visit A&E at 3am – it cost £22 by taxi to get to the hospital!”*
- *“Illegal cycling (on footpaths/ pavements etc.) an issue.*
- *“Transport for older people to get to social groups – there aren’t enough volunteer drivers.”*

• *“Public transport has improved but are still issues, e.g. wheelchair and pushchair access and*

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.irf.org.uk/sites/files/irf/credit-debt-low-incomes-summary.pdf>

<sup>38</sup> Finn, D. and Goodship, J. (2014). Take-Up of Benefits and poverty: An evidence and policy review. Inclusion. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Available from: <http://www.inclusion.org.uk/publications/take-benefits-and-poverty-evidence-and-policy-review> accessed August 2015.

- *“If you use a wheelchair although there is a ramp there is no help to fold the chair or store it or luggage so can be too much of a bother and drivers can make you feel you are a nuisance.”*

## **Recommendation 9: *A moving experience***

**Improve accessibility to integrated transport by actively:**

- a. Supporting social enterprise solutions to improve local transport, particularly in non-commercial routes.**
- b. Taking a more strategic approach to market failures in transport, particularly bus routes and frequency of key bus services.**

The main feedback related to bus routes, comfort and safety within buses, affordability of parking charges and illegal cycling. The biggest problem seems to be the lack of public transport provision for residents in some parts of the city, access to the General hospital and out-of-hours travel for key bus routes. Specific issues cited in the feedback were that residents living in some areas and using certain bus routes and services were disadvantaged because of poor connectivity across the city, difficult access to both hospitals, irregularity of bus services and a complete lack of public transport in some areas on Sundays and on bank holidays.

### **Why have we made this recommendation?**

Southampton is a port city and is well connected by a network of bus, rail and ferry services that operate within Southampton. It has an excellent one-stop destination for travel information and advice (My Journey) and Solent Go, a new, smart travel card that can be used to travel all over South Hampshire.

Transport plays a critical role in reducing inequalities – it can open opportunities for employment (and income) and provide access to services, learning, cultural and social activities, thus improving wellbeing too.

We received a huge amount of feedback on the topic of public transport. The experience for those who are more reliant on it highlights issues of affordability and access and the impact this has on their daily lives.

We recognise that the City Council and other public sector agencies can only act as facilitators to make improvement. However, accessible and affordable public transport is key to getting and keeping jobs, reducing isolation and accessing a range of services including healthcare and leisure.

This recommendation will require the city to explore and implement the following:

- Secure funding for Independent Travel Training for people with learning disabilities building upon the success of Special Educational Needs travel planning as part of the My Journey project.

- Ensure Jobcentre Plus improves travel options for people looking for, and starting in, employment.
- Require local bus companies to limit the number of changes to bus services to no more than four per service, per year as part of the emerging Bus Information Strategy.
- Ensure more effective consultations between transport providers and other stakeholder groups to make the impacts of any changes understood, and embed transport into Southampton City Council's Equality and Safety Impact Assessment.
- Support a range of provision options (taxis, community transport) for non-commercial routes and to improve connectivity with other transport services.
- Promote uses of interchanges for connections throughout the city by bus (and other modes) utilising the Legible Networks system being rolled out as well as physical infrastructure where viable.
- Improve accessibility and comfortable travel by extending good practice such as audio announcements for visually impaired people and safety features in buses.

#### **What difference will this recommendation make?**

It will improve access to affordable public transport to serve areas, routes and times that are currently not commercial for private companies. This will make it easier for local people to consider and accept local jobs, reduce isolation and improve access to a range of services including healthcare, learning and leisure for people who are currently have little or no transport options.

We identify Southampton City Council, transport providers and community/social enterprises, voluntary sector organisations and transport user groups as key in delivering this.

### **Fairer organisations and fairer communities**

The delivery of the recommendations outlined within the fairer employment and fairer living themes need to be underpinned by strong organisations and communities

We see civil society as having a key role in delivering fairness. As commission, we have actively engaged with a whole range of agencies and individuals and encourage community engagement and activism. We believe that Southampton will be a fairer place when all citizens participate in the political, social and economic life of the city.

We heard evidence of the importance of co-production and the need to ensure engagement and participation to develop and improve local services. The need to involve those who use services, in the redesign of those services, was also evident throughout the feedback we received.

A major theme was basic customer care. Respondents felt that organisations should work more effectively (alone or together), and that services and systems should be easier to navigate and access. They also wanted them to be better designed, in partnership with those they are intended for. There were many comments received about poor customer care and poor service, too – services and organisations do not always talk to, listen to and value their customers.

- *“Wish the services would talk to each other. Be more joined up. I always fill in forms about sharing my information, but then they never do! This applies to health, social services and care agencies. Every time you get a visit you go through it all again and then they just give you what’s there – not personal to you.”*
- *“There is a sense that the poor aren’t trying at the moment but this isn’t the truth.”*
- *“Central point of contact for information about all services / benefits / help available. People know the help that is needed, but don’t know whether it exists, what it is called.”*
- *“Literacy and access to the internet are also big issues”.*

We believe the city needs to focus on working in partnership with service users and on developing shared values across organisations to promote and deliver fairness.

We also believe the city needs to build on the strength and shared values of its communities in ensuring fairness for all.

## **Fairer organisations**

### **Recommendation 10: Social value**

**Organisations, in procuring goods and services, should maximise local economic and social outcomes through improved application of the Social Value Act to:**

- a. Increase employment and skills of local residents.**
- b. Use local supply chains to develop capacity in local organisations with a long term commitment to the city.**

#### **Why have we made this recommendation?**

We all need to use all our resources to secure benefits to the city's communities. The Social Value Act was introduced in January 2013. It requires people who commission public services to think about how they can also secure wider social, economic and environmental benefits.

Before they start the procurement process, people responsible for commissioning goods and services should consider whether the services they are going to buy, or the way they are going to buy them, could secure these benefits for their area or stakeholders. The Act is a tool to help commissioners get more value for money out of procurement. It also encourages commissioners to talk to their local provider market or community to design better services, often finding new and innovative solutions to difficult problems.

However, compliance with the Act can take the form of merely considering potential actions, rather than carrying them out. Therefore we believe that local organisations, particularly public sector, should introduce requirements in their procurement processes for bidders to demonstrate how they will create skills, employment and business opportunities for local people, to weight these responses in their allocation of contracts, and monitor the activities as part of the contractual arrangements.

Locally this has been used to good effect by some public authorities. For example, Southampton City Council set benchmarks for local skills and employment in the contract for the refurbishment of the Civic Centre. However, there is an opportunity to extend this approach to other contract areas and other organisations. The Southampton Fairness Commission would like this model to be promoted more widely and the good practice to be extended.

#### **What difference will this recommendation make?**

Even in times of austerity, organisations in the city let hundreds of millions of pounds worth of contracts every year, yet they do not routinely build local social or economic outcomes into the tendering process. Often this would be at little or no additional cost, yet would create hundreds of new opportunities to raise the incomes and prospects for our residents.



For example, through its planning processes, Southampton City Council requires developers to deliver employment and skills for local people. Over four years and more than 50 developments, this has led to more than 300 apprenticeships being created. Over 700 unemployed people have been supported into a job, and 470 work experience placements have been provided. A similar approach through procurement processes (particularly across public-sector agencies) could make a significant impact on the opportunities for our residents to gain and progress in local employment.

We identify Southampton Connect as key in delivering this.

### **Fairer communities**

#### **Recommendation 11:**

**Promote zero tolerance of bullying, hate crime and discrimination, by increasing awareness in the city of reporting mechanisms and organisations improving their responses and support for victims.**

##### **Why have we made this recommendation?**

Our vision and principles of fairness cannot be fully achieved and sustained without ensuring we continue to tackle bullying, discrimination and hate crime.

The Southampton Fairness Commission recognises the extensive partnership work undertaken in the city by our community, voluntary, public and private sectors in this area of work. However, the Southampton Fairness Commission also heard wide ranging experiences of discrimination across the city. It is concerned about the impacts of the combination of austerity and welfare reforms, alongside significant reductions in public sector spending/services and pressures on voluntary and community organisations. In particular, that this may work to reverse progress on tackling discrimination, erode some of the goodwill in communities and increase community tensions, whilst diminishing resources to support individuals experiencing discrimination and in particular 'hate crime'.

According to the 'Hate Crime Incidents Report', Southampton had 303 reports in March 2013, 299 in March 2014 and 449 in March 2015. This gave a rolling average of 350 reports - slightly higher Portsmouth, which had a rolling average of 302.

We recognise these statistics represent just the 'tip of the iceberg' and behind these statistics are many victims who have experienced or continue to experience hate crime, without reporting it or accessing support to deal with it. We also recognise for every reported incident there is a victim of crime. We also recognise the impact of tolerating hate crime, bullying and discrimination on wider society.

### **What difference will this recommendation make?**

Hate Crime remains vastly under-reported for complex reasons, and within this the number of homophobic incidents reported is far less than racist ones, while other areas such as mental health, disability and age are extremely under-reported.

The 'Helping Victims of Hate Crime' app was launched by Hampshire Constabulary in 2013. It is designed to give people more information in one handy place about hate crimes and hate incidents and encourage communities to come forward and report them. It also gives information about how to report anonymously and to a third party organisation called True Vision. Since its launch, there has been an increase in reporting.

We want to support this work, and see the council and police as having a leading role in monitoring and reporting.

Alongside this, we want to increase people's confidence in reporting their experiences and to also encourage those who witness hate crime to report it. This will mean an increase in reports and increased demand for support. To do this we need to work across the city to increase awareness of what is meant by hate crime, why it should be reported, how to report it and about the support available for victims.

We see communities, agencies and employers as having key role in delivering this.

### **Recommendation 12:**

**Support individuals and communities to take responsibility for improving the quality of their lives and their environment through funding of small community-run preventative projects to reduce inequality.**

#### **Why have we made this recommendation?**

The Southampton Fairness Commission recognises the key role of civil society in identifying and addressing fairness and inequality. It has heard extensively that a 'top-down' approach that takes away people's social involvement and autonomy inhibits growth in communities, makes people feel that they have little real say and no power, and leads to less well-designed interventions.

The complexity of factors that contribute to unfairness and inequality in society, and individual identity and personal experiences of disadvantage, mean that no single approach can be imposed to tackle social injustice. However, a community-based and led approach enables effective identification of issues, solutions and change at the local and individual level.

Good ideas and community-generated self-help schemes need resources. The work of the Southampton Fairness Commission has, through engagement and consultation, been given access to a whole range of suggestions, ideas and potential projects which could contribute to promote fairness in the city.

### **What difference will this recommendation make?**

Funding from public sector organisations and other grants programmes, including the Southampton Fairness Fund (see recommendation 13) will increase the local availability of resources for small community-run projects. This will increase participation and outcomes relating to with them.

We identify local communities as key in delivering this, supported by public sector organisations and other funders.

## **Recommendation 13:**

**Set up a 'Southampton Fairness Fund', an 'employee giving' scheme matched by employers and allocated in a transparent and democratic way by an independent voluntary sector organisation to promote fairness.**

### **Why have we made this recommendation?**

The concept of a local 'Southampton Fairness Fund' is a based on corporate and individual/ employee 'giving' schemes. The corporate scheme would encourage employers to pool their donations in a Community Fund, so as to maximise resource spend locally. Employers who have not previously donated to good causes would be encouraged to do so. The individual employee giving scheme would operate on the basis of direct deduction of spare pennies from wages.

### **What difference will this recommendation make?**

The 'Southampton Fairness Fund' will be used to promote fairness and develop and support corporate social responsibility within in organisations in the city. Volunteering opportunities would also be promoted as part of this work. The additional resources it will create will be used to develop and support projects and activities in the city which promote fairness or forestall the growth of inequality.

We identify Southampton Voluntary Services as key in delivering this.

## 10. A Fairness Index for the City

	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Desired Outcomes</b>	<b>Potential Measures</b>	<b>Key Agencies</b>
1	Create a 'Great Place to Work' city with commitment from employers, including the promotion of the Living Wage and recognise achievements at an annual award ceremony.	<p>All major employers in the city sign up to and commit to a creating a Great Place to Work city.</p> <p>Increase in the number of Living Wage employers in the city. (See also Rec 6 and Rec 10).</p> <p>All care leavers are in employment, education or training.</p> <p>Improve average weekly wage for Southampton residents so it is equal to that for commuters into the city/SE average.</p>	<p>Number of employers signed up a Great Place to Work.</p> <p>Number of employees covered by a Great Place to Work.</p> <p>Number of Living Wage Employers in the city.</p> <p>Reduction in NEETs and all care leavers are in employment, education or training.</p> <p>Average weekly wage for Southampton residents working in Southampton increased to city average.</p>	<p>Southampton Connect</p> <p>Hampshire Chamber of Commerce</p>
2	Establish a comprehensive support service designed to help people deal with involuntary self-employment fairly and safely - e.g. dealing successfully with HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC), insurance, cash flow, credit control and VAT.	Self-employed are able to access bespoke support in the city.	<p>Support service set up.</p> <p>Number of people accessing the service.</p> <p>Type of support given.</p> <p>Reduction in insolvencies, sole trader failures.</p>	Local advice and support services
3	Establish a tactical fund to address urgent skills shortages in the local labour market; to be allocated by a representative group of employers, and employee representatives, to be financed by pooled contributions from strategic funders – Skills Funding Agency (SFA), Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and their contracted providers.	Local skills shortages are addressed effectively.	<p>Number of interventions.</p> <p>Number of people accessing interventions.</p> <p>Outcomes of those accessing interventions.</p> <p>Reduction in the long term unemployment.</p> <p>Reduction in out of work benefit claimants.</p>	<p>Local employers</p> <p>Skills Funding Agency (SFA),</p> <p>Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP),</p> <p>Department for Work and Pensions (DWP).</p>
4	Increase the availability of affordable and good quality housing by using alternative funding mechanisms outside public sector constraints to build new homes and exploit under-used resources such as empty properties, self-build and container conversions. This should also provide local employment opportunities.	<p>Local potential for alternative funding to build new homes is fully explored.</p> <p>Potential to improve the use of existing resources is fully explored.</p> <p>Good practice from other areas shared.</p>	<p>Number of new housing units in the city to rent and to buy</p> <p>Number of affordable housing units in the city to rent and to buy</p> <p>Increase in the quality of housing available.</p> <p>Reduction in number and length of wait on social housing waiting list.</p> <p>Increase in employment</p>	<p>Social Housing Providers</p> <p>Private Landlords</p> <p>Funding providers</p> <p>Employers (Construction)</p>

	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Desired Outcomes</b>	<b>Potential Measures</b>	<b>Key Agencies</b>
			opportunities in construction.	
5	Encourage our citizens to take individual responsibility for healthier lifestyles and all agencies to take collective action to support this through citywide campaigns to reduce smoking, drinking and obesity.	Improved health and wellbeing in individuals.  Measurable improvement in local health indicators.	Reduction in obesity rates. Reduction in infant mortality rate. Reduction in smoking prevalence. Reduction in alcohol related hospital admissions/ preventable death.	Health Services  Public Health  Community based intervention services.
6	All health and social care commissioners should ensure that contracts with providers require them to demonstrate that they have taken action to achieve equity of outcomes. The Health and Wellbeing Board to monitor inequalities and take actions to address them.	Improved health and functionality for those with long term illnesses.  Improved quality of and longer life expectancy.  More Living Wage employers – leading to an increase in average wage for Southampton residents/ citizens.  Easier employment for people from disadvantaged groups leading to fewer children living in poverty.	Differences in life expectancy for males and females from different parts of the city is reduced.  Measurable improvement to quality of life.  See Rec 1. Increase in the average wage for Southampton residents. Increase in the number of employees receiving the Living Wage or above.	Southampton Health and Wellbeing Board  Health and Social Care Commissioners  Providers/employers
7	Improve access to, and awareness of financial services for all by building capacity in community finance institutions and initiatives e.g. Credit Unions and user-friendly local banking.	Well established credit unions able to scale up to provide viable and reliable alternatives to traditional financial institutions as well as unscrupulous money lending.	Increased numbers with credit unions, banks and building societies accounts.  Reduced numbers using payday lenders.	Community finance institutions and initiatives  Large organisations
8	Improve the ability of people to manage money better by: Promoting and providing learning modules for debt and money management in schools and colleges. Developing and implementing a programme to increase awareness of and fair access to welfare entitlements, particularly linked to key life-transition points.	Improved financial resilience and financial inclusion. Improved take-up of welfare entitlements.	Reduction in problem debt for individuals. Increased take-up of a range of welfare entitlements.	Keyworkers Advice Agencies Schools and Colleges Jobcentre Plus
9	Improve accessibility to integrated transport by actively: Supporting social enterprise solutions	Reduced isolation and access to affordable transport	Social enterprises running buses in non-commercial routes.	Southampton City Council Transport providers

	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Desired Outcomes</b>	<b>Potential Measures</b>	<b>Key Agencies</b>
	to improve local transport, particularly in non-commercial routes. Taking a more strategic approach to market failures in transport, particularly bus routes and frequency of key bus services.	to key services and leisure activities for all. Limited number of route changes in a 12 month period.		Community/Social Enterprises Voluntary Sector Organisations Transport User Groups
10	Organisations, in procuring goods and services, should maximise local economic and social outcomes through improved application of the Social Value Act to: Increase employment and skills of local residents. Use local supply chains to develop capacity in local organisations with a long term commitment to the city.	Better use of resources to ensure fairness and equity. Improved social and economic outcomes via procurement.	Number of organisations introducing requirements in their procurement processes for bidders to demonstrate how they will: - ensure fairness. - create skills, employment and business opportunities for local people.	Southampton Connect
11	Promote zero tolerance of bullying, hate crime and discrimination, by increasing awareness in the city of reporting mechanisms and organisations improving their responses and support for victims	Currently level activity maintained or increased.	Increase in reporting of hate crime.  Increase in the % of residents reporting "Your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together." (Southampton City Survey).	Safe City Partnership
12	Support individuals and communities to take responsibility for improving the quality of their lives and their environment through funding of small community-run preventative projects to reduce inequality.	Increase in funding distributed for 'fairness' projects and activities in the city.	Number of project and activities supported.	Local Organisations Southampton Voluntary Services
13	Set up a 'Southampton Fairness Fund', an 'employee giving' scheme matched by employers and allocated in a transparent and democratic way by an independent voluntary sector organisation to promote fairness.	Increase in corporate social responsibility	Set up a 'Southampton Fairness Fund', an 'employee giving' scheme matched by employers and allocated in a transparent and democratic way by an independent voluntary sector organisation to promote fairness.	Independent Voluntary Sector Organisation

## **12. Next Steps**

The Southampton Fairness Commission urges all organisations named in this report to work with us in affirming commitments to the delivery of the recommendations. We will work with partners to identify detailed actions and timescales by the official launch event in December 2015. We will continue to work with partners over the next 3 years. We will develop a performance management framework to measure progress towards Southampton becoming a fairer city and will develop monitoring reports during this period to review and update progress annually.

DRAFT

## **Appendix 1: Speakers and Facilitators**

### **Public Meetings:**

#### **Employment:**

Dan Finn – University of Portsmouth  
Michael Steel – JCI International  
Ian Woodland – Unite  
Ceri Connor & Karen Cahill – Solent NHS Trust

#### **Income:**

Chris Davis - Southampton City Mission  
Andy Sherman – Department for Work & Pensions  
Vicki Orba - No Limits and Chair of Southampton Anti-Poverty Network  
Jeff Downing – SPECTRUM  
Jackie Steward – DAIN

#### **Health:**

Andrew Mortimore - Director of Public Health  
Stephanie Ramsey - Southampton City CCG/Southampton City Council  
Will Rosie – SPECTRUM  
Mark Kelsey - GP  
Debbie Ross - Open Sight

#### **Housing:**

Richard Pitt – Love Southampton  
Liz Slater – Southampton City Council  
Helena Kurzynska - Two Saints

#### **Transport:**

Pete Boustred – Southampton City Council

#### **Growing Older:**

Marianne Plater – Solent Health Care  
Stephen Press – Stepacross CIC and The Third Age Centre charity (3AC)  
Pat Turner – Unison Retired Members Section  
Paul Lewzey – Councillor, Southampton City Council

#### **Growing Up:**

Theresa Leavy – Southampton City Council  
Liz Taylor - Advisor to Public Health and the Integrated Commissioning Unit on Early Intervention for Under 5s and their families.  
Julie Marron & Young Carers Representatives – Southampton Young Carers Project





## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>E&amp;T 10 - Riverside Pitch &amp; Putt Course</b> - explore a viable external franchise or partnership arrangement.
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>The Riverside Park 18 hole Pitch &amp; Putt course operates from April to September each year.</p> <p>It primarily attracts visitors from the local area (Townhill, Bitterne Park, Swaythling, Mansbridge) but due to the close proximity of Woodmill Lane car park, it is accessible to users from across the city.</p> <p>Users represent a diverse demographic, with groups of younger people and family groups particularly prominent. Usage varies from season to season dependent on weather and other competing attractions but generally between 6,000 and 7,000 rounds per year are played.</p> <p>The course is suitable and enjoyed by players of all standards, from complete beginners to keen golfers practicing their ‘short game’.</p> <p>In recent years the facility has made an operating loss of around £15k per annum. There is little current internal scope to adjust the cost or income base to positively affect this position. It is therefore proposed to seek a viable external partnership to run the facility in 2016 to remove this ongoing budget pressure, and prevent the potential closure of the facility.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	Although the trend of usage in recent years is generally down, the course remains popular and offers an attractive introduction to the game of golf. Overall participation in the game of golf may decline in longer term without the availability of such local and accessible entry level facilities.

	The course is a relatively popular feature of Riverside Park, particularly on a warm summer's day. Its closure would reduce the overall leisure offer of the park, and may affect the popularity of the park as a whole for longer half day / whole day family visits.
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	Closure may in the short term potentially increase usage at Southampton Golf Course (particularly 9 hole course) and Weston Pitch and Putt franchise.  Development of the facility through a partnership or specialist franchise arrangement could improve the overall offer to the customer through inclusion of additional facilities (e.g. catering, skills tuition).
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	John Horton
<b>Date</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Mitch Sanders
<b>Date</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	The course currently offers a diversionary activity for young people during the long summer evenings.	Skate Park and tennis courts already exist in close proximity. Consultation currently taking place through Friends group over provision of other facilities for younger park users.
<b>Poverty</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>	Overall participation in the game of golf may decline in longer term without the availability of such local and accessible entry level facilities.	Availability of alternative facilities at Southampton Golf Course and Weston Shore.

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>E&amp;T 12 – Reduce Bus Subsidy Budget.</b>
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>The city council supports a number of bus services for areas of the city where commercial bus services do not operate. These services are well established and were identified by the city council for support as they provide access for people who are unable to access core bus services.</p> <p>The council currently provides subsidies for the following routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B1: Bitterne to Bitterne (via Sholing)</li> <li>• B2: Bitterne to Bitterne (via Townhill Park/ Midanbury)</li> <li>• B3: Bitterne to Bitterne (via Upper Deacon Road/Taunton Drive)</li> <li>• W1: City centre to Romsey (diversion via Portswood)</li> <li>• X11: Lords Hill to City Centre (the section to Hedge End is commercial so not covered by these proposals)</li> <li>• X12: City Centre to Tesco Millbrook via Freemantle</li> <li>• X14: Bitterne to Tesco Bursledon via Harefield.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal is to reduce support from £218,000 to £122,000 for 2016/2017.</p> <p>This will result in the withdrawal of support for Route X12: City Centre to Tesco Millbrook via Freemantle).</p>

	<p>It will also result in the withdrawal of support for Route W1 which operates from the City Centre to Romsey. The council currently only funds the diversion that takes in Westwood Road – Portswood – Highfield Lane.</p> <p>The decision to withdraw funding for these routes was based on the subsidy amount per passenger trip, together with passengers per hour, alongside access to health and employment.</p> <p>In addition, the X14 (Bitterne to Tesco Bursledon via Harefield and Thornhill) is ending on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2015. This is not due to this proposal. This was a trial service and is being withdrawn as ridership has not reached a sustainable level.</p> <p>Services B1, B2 and B3 are being retained. The X11 service (Lords Hill to City Centre) is also being retained as it provides a peak hour journeys for the Upper Shirley/Hill Lane area of the city and access to Richard Taunton College, Southampton General Hospital and providing access to employment in an area which up until January 2014 had a commercial bus service.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	<p>The services being withdrawn are generally used by elderly and disabled people and provide off peak travel to enable residents to visit major supermarkets, local shops and other facilities for up to a few hours. Current users of these services will find their travel options more limited. The additional distance to reach the alternative major bus services/routes will be more difficult for many.</p>
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Simon Bell, Public Transport and Operations Manager
<b>Date</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> November 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Paul Walker
<b>Date</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> November 2015

**Potential Impact**

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	The majority of passengers on supported services are elderly. Current users will find their travel	Information will be placed on buses, at bus stops and at locations where

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	options more limited. The additional distance to reach the alternative major bus services/routes will be more difficult for many.	<p>customers are likely to visit in addition to social media well in advance of the service change.</p> <p>The provision of shared taxis or community car schemes will be investigated prior to the withdrawal of the funding. Passengers would need to pay a fare to use this services.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	Current users will find their travel options more limited. These services penetrate residential areas where people may find the alternative major bus services/routes more difficult to access due to the additional distance to reach a bus stop.	<p>Information will be placed on buses, at bus stops and at locations where customers are likely to visit in addition to social media well in advance of the service change.</p> <p>The provision of shared taxis or community car schemes will be investigated prior to the withdrawal of the funding. Passengers would need to pay a fare to use this service.</p>
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	Bus services are generally used more by women than men.	
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<b>Poverty</b>	With the withdrawal of services, access to supermarkets will be reduced and residents may have limited access to low cost food, although local alternatives may be available - but more expensive.	The provision of shared taxis or community car schemes will be considered.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>	With the withdrawal of services, access to local facilities will be reduced and residents may find that they will be unable to complete their journey. It may also result in increased social isolation.	The provision of shared taxis or community car schemes will be considered.





## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<p><b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b></p>	<p><b>E&amp;T 15 - Bus Lane and Traffic Marking Enforcement Cameras.</b></p> <p>The proposal is to introduce a camera enforcement system on bus lanes in the City.</p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial installation of fixed cameras on 3 sites</li> <li>• Later introduction of a camera car</li> <li>• Potential introduction of fixed cameras on other sites.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b></p>	<p>Transport Highways and Parking services is responsible for the policy and strategy relating to all transport activities in the City.</p> <p>It is also responsible for strategic direction of the maintenance and management of the highway network including maintenance and enforcement of all parking related functions.</p> <p>Customers include all transport users in the City including residents, visitors and businesses.</p>
<p><b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b></p>	<p>To deter unauthorised vehicles from occupying bus lanes across the City.</p> <p>Potential issue is negative media coverage due to increased Penalty Charges to offending drivers.</p>
<p><b>Potential Positive Impacts</b></p>	<p>This proposal will benefit all due to reduced bus service journey times and improved punctuality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved efficiency of bus lanes reducing journey times and improving punctuality increasing desirability of this mode of transport;</li> <li>• Shift to alternative modes of transport leading to health and air quality benefits;</li> <li>• Avoid conflict between buses and other drivers;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced conflict with Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's);</li> <li>• Evidence of contraventions provided;</li> <li>• More time efficient enforcement system.</li> </ul>
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Greg Churcher
<b>Date</b>	28/10/15

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	John Harvey
<b>Date</b>	28/10/15

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	Will aid road safety by removing unexpected vehicles from bus lane.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	No negative impact identified.	N/A
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>	Motorists may attract contraventions as they get used to the new restrictions.	Warning letters will be issued when the restrictions are first implemented.

## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>E&amp;T 19 – Park &amp; Walk Variable Charging.</b>
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>Parking Services is responsible for the provision, management, maintenance and enforcement of all on-street parking activities in the City and many off street facilities:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,500 Pay and Display bays in the City Centre</li> <li>• 80 Pay and Display bays around the Common and the General Hospital</li> <li>• 5 Multi Storey Car Parks with 2,800 spaces</li> <li>• 30 surface car parks with 2,100 spaces</li> <li>• 21 suburban car parks</li> <li>• 1,300 residents disabled parking bays</li> <li>• 23 residents Parking Zones</li> <li>• 3.5 million transactions per year on and Off Street</li> <li>• Annual income On and Off Street circa £7M per annum</li> <li>• 40,000 Penalty Charge Notices are issued each year.</li> </ul> <p>Parking Services provides a service that has an impact on all residents, visitors and businesses in the City.</p> <p>This proposal is to reduce traffic congestion around West Quay Shopping Centre by introducing a Park and Walk scheme over weekends and Bank Holidays by implementing reduced parking charges in the City’s two Multi Storey Car Parks to the north of the City centre.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and</b>	The reduction in car park charges will redistribute car parking activities across the city on the busiest days by

<b>Issues</b>	offering competitive pricing in the less used car parks.
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	<p>Bedford Place and Grosvenor Multi Storey Car Parks are not well used even though they are located approximately 500 metres from the end of the main shopping street in the City.</p> <p>It is proposed to introduce a Park and Walk Scheme with one charging band fee of £2 all day between 08.00 – 18.00 Saturdays and 12:00 – 18:00 Sunday and Bank/Public Holidays.</p> <p>This should divert some motorists from queuing for the closer car parks with associated congestion and air quality benefits. In addition, a pleasant walk through one of the City parks will add to the experience of the visit to the City.</p>
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Jas Sahota
<b>Date</b>	15/10/2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Paul Walker
<b>Date</b>	16.10.2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Dropping the parking charge to only £2 all day will also help customers on a lower income.	N/A
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>E&amp;T 18</b> – Introduce charges for cone deployment.
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>Parking Services is responsible for the provision, management, maintenance and enforcement of all on-street parking activities in the City and many off street facilities.</p> <p>Parking Services provide upon request ‘Cones’ to the general public to be used to ‘reserve’ space on the highway to allow for specific vehicles to park such as spaces for funeral vehicles, entourage, weddings, and furniture delivery/home removal vehicles subject to assessment.</p> <p>The proposal is to introduce charges for cone deployment. This service is available to enable event organisers, businesses and residents to suspend an area to allow temporary access to a given location. Charges will depend on the scale of the deployment, with a proposed minimum charge of £15 for up to 10 cones.</p> <p>If Pay and Display bays are suspended, there will be an additional charge of up to £14 per day for each space to cover lost revenue and additional signing requirements.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	<p>Due to the excess demand for kerb space it means that often interested parties (residents/business) cannot be guaranteed access to an area of road (highway) for a specific purpose, such as utility maintenance/funeral cortege/house removals.</p> <p>To assist in gaining access, the council is authorised to</p>

	<p>provide and/or deploy 'cones' as a method of suspension of the road/highway for temporary access to a given location (regulated or unregulated). Any vehicle parked in an area where no-waiting cones have been correctly deployed will be committing the offence of failing to comply with a traffic sign which is enforceable by the police.</p> <p>The deployment of 'cones' does not guarantee access as they may be moved without consent and are advisory only and is not enforceable by the Civil Enforcement process.</p>
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	Introduction of charging should see a reduction in deployment requests that will release enforcement/officer time to be deployed to fulfil core activities whilst ensuring that the cost of providing the service is covered.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Colin Chapman
<b>Date</b>	15.10.15

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Paul Walker
<b>Date</b>	16.10.2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	Existing Disabled Parking Provisions do not extend to cone deployment.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A



Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Introduction of charge may be prohibited to access of facilities for certain activities.	Exceptions to be made available, such as 'free' for funeral cortege.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>E&amp;T 20</b> – Revert disabled on street parking bays into pay and display.
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>Parking Services is responsible for the provision, management, maintenance and enforcement of all on-street parking activities in the City and many off street facilities:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,500 Pay and Display bays in the City Centre</li> <li>• 80 Pay and Display bays around the Common and the General Hospital</li> <li>• 5 Multi Storey Car Parks with 2,800 spaces</li> <li>• 30 surface car parks with 2,100 spaces</li> <li>• 21 suburban car parks</li> <li>• 1,300 residents disabled parking bays</li> <li>• 23 residents parking Zones</li> <li>• 3.5 million transactions per year on and Off Street</li> <li>• Annual income On and Off Street circa £7M per annum</li> <li>• 40,000 Penalty Charge Notices are issued each year</li> </ul> <p>Parking Services provides a service that has an impact on all residents, visitors and businesses in the City.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	<p>The proposal is to revert 17 Disabled Persons’ Parking Bays in Ogle Road and Portland Street back to Pay and Display bays which can be utilised by all.</p> <p>It is proposed to leave the parking bays at their current size (which are 6.6m to accommodate mobility requirements) so that disabled drivers will still be able to use the spaces at no charge.</p>

	The impact for disabled drivers will be minimal as they can still have free parking access to these parking bays.
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	These are prime parking bays for short term parking and converting these to dual purpose will make better use of road space.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Jas Sahota
<b>Date</b>	19/10/15

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Paul Walker
<b>Date</b>	22.10.2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	Minimal as disabled drivers will not be excluded from parking in this area.	It is proposed not to install standard Pay and Display sizes of 5.5m but to leave these bays to current size of 6.6m to accommodate mobility requirements.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negatives impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>E &amp; T 24</b> - Efficiencies following relocation of Bereavement Services from Bugle Street to the Crematorium.
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>Southampton City Council currently provides Bereavement Services from first floor premises of the Registration Office in Bugle Street situated in the city centre.</p> <p>Bereavement Services provide guidance with the administrative and legal procedures for arranging a cremation at Southampton Crematorium, arranging a burial in a Southampton cemetery, purchasing and transferring the right to a grave, cemetery and crematorium memorials and arranging funerals under the Public Health Act 1984.</p> <p>The service carries out approximately 2,400 cremations, 650 interments. 165 attended scattering of ashes and 35 PHA funerals each year.</p> <p>In addition to the telephone calls associated with the above there are around 1,500 calls relating to other aspects of service provision.</p> <p>Footfall into the office is not high with around 1,000 customers attending in person annually. In addition there are approximately 1,200 visits from Funeral Directors delivering statutory documentation each year.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	The proposal to relocate Bereavement Services from Bugle Street (City Centre) to the Crematorium (Bassett Green Road). This will mean the service is moved to an outlying area which may make it less easily accessible for

	some customers.
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	Colocation of Bereavement Services at the crematorium will improve customer service and enable the team to be more efficient. Single point of contact for Funeral Directors.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Linda Francis
<b>Date</b>	5/11/15

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Mitch Sanders
<b>Date</b>	5/11/2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	Non City Centre location.	Ground floor more accessible office - no stairs to negotiate.  Unilink buses run every 20 mins from West Park Road to Crematorium.  Free onsite parking.  Staff could arrange to meet at Bugle Street in exceptional circumstances.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Muslim and Jewish Communities do not cremate and may not wish to enter building via chapel entrances.	Provide separate entrance to administration office.
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

<b>Orientation</b>		
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Non City Centre location.	Unilink buses run every 20 mins from West Park Road to Crematorium.  Free onsite parking.  Staff could arrange to meet at Bugle Street in exceptional circumstances.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

**This page is intentionally left blank**





The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>E&amp;T 27</b> – Introduce new rates for cemeteries and cremation.
<b>Brief Service Profile</b>	<p>This service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a burial and cremation service for the bereaved including the maintenance of appropriate memorials.</li> <li>• Operates the crematorium and manage 5 cemeteries and 2 gardens of remembrance.</li> <li>• Undertakes funerals on behalf of the community for people die alone and in poverty (the council has a statutory duty to arrange funerals for people who die where no arrangements have been made).</li> <li>• Maintains historic and current cemetery and grave records and provide a Genealogy service relating to them.</li> </ul>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	There is a risk that an increase in fees, due to local competition, could reduce demand and therefore overall income. However, having assessed the competition it is felt that this increase could be applied whilst maintaining demand.
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Linda Francis, Bereavement & Registration Services Manager
<b>Date</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Mitch Sanders, Head of Regulatory & City Services
<b>Date</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

## Potential Negative Impacts

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<b>Age</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Gender</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Would impact on those already under financial pressure, especially those on benefits, to fund funeral arrangements.	The council has a statutory duty under the Public Health Act 1984 to provide a funeral for those where there is no one able or willing to make the necessary arrangements.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		



The public sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>E&amp;T 28</b> – Introduce new rates for pest control, clinical waste and filthy premises.
<b>Brief Service Profile</b>	<p>The service provides a comprehensive pest eradication and proofing service to Southampton’s residents and businesses. The main pests dealt with are rodents (rats and mice) and insects (bed bugs and cockroaches).</p> <p>The service collects and organises the disposal of clinical waste in partnership with the Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> <p>The service also arranges and carries out all aspects of cleaning up filthy or verminous premises.</p> <p>The service protects public health by offering affordable services to vulnerable people and adds value by treating the council’s own estate, including council housing, parks and open spaces. Many people on low incomes would be unable to access services provided by private companies, leading to public health and reputational risks.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	<p>The proposal is to increase fees in order that the service covers its costs.</p> <p>There is a risk that an increase in fees due to local competition could reduce demand and therefore overall income for a service that currently offers a discount to those claiming benefits.</p>
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	The proposed increase in fees would help to ensure that the service is sustainable and will therefore continue to be available to deal with pests with a public health significance and maintain its capacity to support Southampton’s most vulnerable residents.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Janet Hawkins

	Regulatory Services Manager
<b>Date</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Mitch Sanders, Head of Regulatory & City Services
<b>Date</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

### Potential Impacts

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions</b>
<b>Age</b>	No disproportionate impact is anticipated – customers of the pest control service are drawn from across the entire age demographic.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	Those claiming a disability benefit and currently entitled to a discount may have to pay higher fees for pest control treatments.	Where necessary and on a case by case basis, consideration will be given to waiving fees in cases of extreme financial hardship and, or, allowing payments to be made in instalments.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Gender</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Those claiming a welfare benefit and currently entitled to a discount may have to pay higher fees for pest control treatments.	Where necessary and on a case by case basis, consideration will be given to waiving fees in cases of extreme financial hardship and, or, allowing payments to be made in

		instalments.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>HASC 6 – Telecare:</b> Introduce wider role out of Telecare to reduce the ongoing cost of existing packages and delay the need for clients to require long term support.
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>Telecare is the use of personal alarms and environmental sensors to monitor people’s support needs, enabling them to remain safe and independent in their own homes for longer. Telecare can also support increased independent living for some individuals.</p> <p>There is currently a small telecare service provided by the existing community alarm service. The service received 255 referrals (2014-15), resulting in assessments, with 232 receiving installations, a rise from 119 in 2013. Of the current customer base, around 65% receive the service for less than 1 year.</p> <p>At the request of Southampton City Council and Southampton Clinical Commissioning Group, PA Consultancy have undertaken a telecare diagnostic for Southampton. The final report and proposed numbers will be ready in November. Current estimates indicate improvements in the end to end management of the telecare process, which would see a large proportion of the existing domiciliary care client population (circa 1,576 per annum) in receipt of telecare equipment alongside cohorts of other client groups (e.g. Learning Disability, Disability, frail elderly).</p> <p>The service would achieve this increased roll out of telecare (if commissioned) through a number of key changes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear vision &amp; strategy set out for telehealthcare in</li> </ul>

	<p>Southampton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Driving a culture change and engagement process to prepare the Adult Services workforce to make even more high quality referrals so that telecare becomes an expected element of care packages</li> <li>- Robustly measuring the financial and non financial benefits of enhanced telecare and in doing so improve the use of targeted approaches.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b></p>	<p>The use of telecare enables care to be provided in a more efficient, cost effective way, while also improving the experience for the individual, their carers and the professionals who are involved in providing the care.</p> <p>The use of telecare can impact across a wide range of areas. The two main areas will be a reduction in the number of domiciliary care hours and delayed, reduced or even avoided admissions to residential care settings. Telecare can also offer people with learning disability the opportunity to lead more independent and fulfilling lives within the community. For others the impact is likely to see improved access to support.</p> <p>The provision of telecare also enables better targeting of resources, ensuring that service users have constant access to emergency help at a low cost to the Council.</p> <p>This will require focused engagement with care professionals and service users to convince them of the benefits of using it. The new service will need to put in place targeted communication and training, the right processes and the skills to deploy telecare effectively for service users.</p>
<p><b>Potential Positive Impacts</b></p>	<p>A strategically driven approach to the provision of telecare will see a wide range of positive impacts for the individuals, their carers and the professionals who are involved directly or indirectly in their care package.</p> <p>The following is not an exhaustive list but shows some of the positive impacts, aside from financial savings that telecare can realise:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social workers would receive informed assessment information and regular feedback.</li> <li>• Telecare offers people with learning disability the opportunity to lead more independent and fulfilling lives within the community.</li> <li>• Telecare can be a substitute for costly and intrusive waking-night care and in doing so, increase dignity and independence alongside substantial savings.</li> <li>• Telecare can identify and reveal unexpected factors</li> </ul>



	<p>(carer difficulties, falls, patterns of behaviour), sometimes showing where a small amount of additional support can make a significant difference. Alternatively telecare can reveal that the individual is better positioned than was previously thought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Telecare monitoring can detect if someone's physical or mental condition is deteriorating or improving, based on how frequently they trigger an alert or how they act when talking with monitoring centre staff: something that can be hard to establish by other means.</li> <li>• Offering telecare to children and young people with special educational needs and those on the autistic spectrum, can support greater independence facilitated by technology which can deliver benefits that last a lifetime.</li> <li>• Future potential to provide the option for older people whose needs are not yet acute, but who could benefit from the security of a telecare service that they pay for themselves.</li> </ul>
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Sandra Jerrim
<b>Date</b>	26.10.2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Stephanie Ramsey
<b>Date</b>	5.11.2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	<p>Fear of telecare and technology for providing key elements of their care increased anxiety, resulting in deterioration of circumstances.</p> <p>Use of telecare reduces the level of face to face contact.</p>	<p>Develop robust training and communication approaches so individuals have a full understanding of the positive benefits of telecare.</p> <p>Introduce telecare options that enable face to face calling with professionals, friends and local community services, thereby increasing social capital.</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<b>Disability</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development. Possible positive impact by supporting increased independence.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development. Possible positive impact by supporting increased independence.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development. Possible positive impact by supporting increased independence.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development. Possible positive impact by supporting increased independence	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development. Possible positive impact by supporting increased independence	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development. Possible positive impact by supporting increased independence	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified or directly related negative impact at this stage of the development. Possible positive impact by supporting increased independence.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Individuals may experience restricted access to additional telecare options which require	Ensure assessments provide the necessary access to telecare to meet their presenting

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
	self funding.	eligible needs, but also consider emerging needs and whether this should include additional equipment as a means to avoiding future demand on the Council.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>	Ability to be conversant with technology may exclude some individuals from using telecare.	Ensure a robust assessment is carried out prior to set up and/or provide suitable training.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**Equality and Safety Impact Assessment**

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>HASC 8 – Setting of Personal Budgets to meet unmet eligible adult social care needs.</b>
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>As at 30 September 2015, the council funds the costs of meeting the eligible social care needs of 2,727 adults. The costs are either met in full or in part, depending on the outcome of a financial assessment.</p> <p>212 people whose care and support is currently being funded by the council are potentially directly affected by this proposal.</p> <p>This proposal will also affect the way that Personal Budgets are set for adults with care and support needs in the future.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	<p>The council has a statutory duty under the Care Act 2014 to assess eligibility for social care and support and to set a Personal Budget to meet any unmet eligible social care needs.</p> <p><b>Adults aged over 65 or with a physical disability</b></p> <p>The following figures include people with eligible social care needs who are aged over 65 and individuals with a physical disability:</p> <p>1,611 (76%) adults receive funding for a package of care and support to meet their needs at home (this is known as domiciliary care or home care).</p>

516 (24%) adults receive funding for a suitable residential or nursing home placement to meet their needs.

Of the people who receive home care, 1,524 (95%) adults have a package of care costing less than £500 per week. 87 (5%) of adults have a package of care costing £500 or over. This can be broken down as follows:

Weekly cost of meeting needs at home	Number of people
£500 - £599	31
£600 - £699	19
£700 - £799	10
£800 - £899	8
£900 - £999	8
£1,000 and over	11
Total	87

Where the cost of meeting eligible social care needs is likely to exceed £500 per week, the council proposes to set a Personal Budget at a level that would enable those needs to be met in an appropriate extra care housing scheme, residential or nursing placement.

The council's current published rate for residential care is £368.69 per week. For residential care to support individuals who are living with dementia, this increases to £435.19 per week. The council's current published rate for nursing care is £486.36 per week. (These rates are subject to a separate review with options to be considered by Cabinet in February 2016 and the value of Personal Budgets for individuals affected by this proposal may be adjusted accordingly should these rates be changed.)

For individuals with more complex needs who require specialist or additional support, these costs are sometimes higher. Higher rates are also sometimes paid when contracting with a home outside of the Southampton City Council area or if an appropriate local placement is not available at the council's published rates. These factors would all be taken into account when setting the Personal Budget.

An individual will be able to use their Personal Budget to meet their eligible needs in the extra care housing

scheme, residential or nursing home placement identified. Alternatively, they may choose to put their Personal Budget towards the cost of receiving care and support at home or in an alternative placement.

When setting the Personal Budget, the council will have regard to an individual's views, wishes, feelings and beliefs. Where a preference is expressed that care and support is provided at home rather than in an appropriate extra care housing scheme, residential or nursing placement, but this exceeds the Personal Budget, the council will help to arrange this. However, unless there are exceptional circumstances funding will be limited to the amount of the Personal Budget. If additional funding cannot be secured from alternative sources, then the individual will be supported to move to an appropriate placement.

The eligible social care needs of the 87 adults whose packages of home care currently cost more than £500 per week will be re-assessed and a new Personal Budget will be set according to how much it would cost to meet their needs in the most cost effective way. This will typically mean the cost at which their eligible needs can be met in an extra care housing scheme or in an appropriate residential or nursing placement. This will apply also to adults requiring packages of care and support for the first time.

#### **Adults with a learning disability**

This proposal also relates to individuals with a learning disability who are receiving care and support at home.

Of the individuals with a learning disability who receive care and support at home, 125 out of 600 (21%) have a package of care costing £500 or over. This includes individuals who are living in supported living placements, which are often the most cost-effective way of meeting an individual's complex social care needs.

However, it is estimated that the needs of 45 individuals could be met by setting their Personal Budget at a level that would enable those needs to be met in an appropriate residential or nursing placement, rather than at home. The needs of these individuals will be reassessed and a new Personal Budget will be set accordingly.

	<p>Supported living and Shared Lives placements generally offer a more cost effective alternative to residential care and promote greater levels of independence. These options will therefore be carefully considered in every case when setting a Personal Budget.</p> <p>The eligible social care needs of the 125 adults whose packages of home care currently cost more than £500 per week will be re-assessed and a new Personal Budget will be set according to the most cost effective way of meeting their eligible social care needs. This will apply also to adults with a learning disability requiring packages of care and support for the first time.</p> <p><b>All adults with care and support needs</b></p> <p>Financial support for adult social care is means tested. The value of an individual's home is not taken into account for as long as they live there (or for as long as it is occupied by a person who is: their partner, former partner or civil partner; a relative who is aged 60 or over; the individual's child aged under 18; or a relative who is incapacitated). Therefore, for all individuals with eligible social care needs, moving into a suitable placement may mean that the value of their home is taken into account for the purpose of the financial assessment.</p> <p>Former recipients of funding from the Independent Living Fund (ILF) are excluded from this proposal, because of the special funding arrangements that are in place to support these individuals.</p> <p>[All figures are correct as at 30 September 2015.]</p>
<p><b>Potential Positive Impacts</b></p>	<p>The proposed approach is fairer, as it will assist the council to use its fixed budget to support everyone in Southampton who has eligible adult social care needs.</p> <p>The current position is that the council is using a disproportionate amount of its Adult Social Care budget to support a relatively small number of individuals to receive their care and support at home, even if their needs could be met in an appropriate residential or nursing placement.</p> <p>The proposed approach will assist the council to continue to meet its statutory duty of ensuring that arrangements are in place to meet eligible social care</p>



	needs, in the context of increasing demand for services and budget constraints.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Paul Juan
<b>Date</b>	6 November 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Mark Howell
<b>Date</b>	6 November 2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	<p>Of the 87 people who currently receive a package of home care costing over £500 per week, 50 (57%) are aged under 65, 4 (5%) are aged between 65 and 74, 17 (20%) are aged between 75 and 84 and 16 (18%) are aged 85 and over. [These figures exclude individuals living with a learning disability].</p> <p>Of the 125 individuals living with a learning disability who currently receive a package of home care costing over £500 per week, 112 (90%) are aged under 65, 12 (10%) are aged between 65 and 74 and 1 (&lt;1%) is aged between 75 and 84.</p> <p>For new packages of care and support there is no evidence to suggest that there would be an unequal impact on any particular age group.</p> <p>Older people may find a move to an appropriate residential or</p>	<p>The council will carry out a thorough assessment and will set an individual's Personal Budget at a level that will enable their unmet eligible social care needs to be met in full.</p> <p>The options will be clearly explained to individuals and regard would be had to individual preferences.</p> <p>Individuals would be supported to find and move to an appropriate extra care housing, nursing or residential home placement.</p> <p>In each case, the council would consider whether there were any exceptional reasons to take into account when setting the Personal Budget and this would include a consideration</p>

	nursing placement more difficult.	<p>of any impact on the individual's wellbeing.</p> <p>A phased introduction of this proposal is also being considered to help mitigate any adverse effects.</p> <p>The way in which a Personal Budget is set will be clearly defined.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	<p>Individuals with eligible care and support needs are by definition deemed to have an impairment or illness that affects their ability to achieve two or more outcomes that are defined by regulations.</p> <p>This proposal therefore impacts on individuals living with a physical or disability, where they would otherwise use their Personal Budget to receive care and support at home rather than in an appropriate residential or nursing placement.</p>	<p>The council will carry out a thorough assessment and will set an individual's Personal Budget at a level that will enable their unmet eligible social care needs to be met in full.</p> <p>The options will be clearly explained to individuals and regard would be had to individual preferences.</p> <p>When necessary, individuals would be supported to find and move to an appropriate supported living, Shared Lives, extra care housing, nursing or residential home placement.</p> <p>In each case, the council would consider whether there were any exceptional reasons to take into account when setting the Personal Budget and this would include a consideration of any impact on the individual's wellbeing.</p>

		<p>A phased introduction of this proposal is also being considered to help mitigate any adverse effects.</p> <p>The way in which a Personal Budget is set will be clearly defined.</p>
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	This could potentially adversely affect an individual's marriage or civil partnership if they moved to a residential or nursing home placement, rather than receive care and support at home.	<p>The council will carry out a thorough assessment and will set an individual's Personal Budget at a level that will enable their unmet eligible social care needs to be met in full.</p> <p>The location of a residential or nursing home placement would be taken into account when determining whether it was appropriate (for example, to allow the individual's partner to visit easily).</p> <p>In each case, the council would consider whether there were any exceptional reasons to take into account when setting the Personal Budget and this would include a consideration of any impact on the individual's wellbeing.</p> <p>A phased introduction of this proposal is also being considered to help mitigate any adverse effects.</p>
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	

<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	
<b>Sex (Gender)</b>	A higher proportion of individuals affected by this proposal are female (57%), principally because a greater proportion of older people with eligible support needs are female.	The council will carry out a thorough assessment and will set an individual's Personal Budget at a level that will enable their unmet eligible social care needs to be met in full.
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	
<b>Poverty</b>	<p>Eligibility for financial support to meet social care needs is means tested. Individuals with savings or assets in over £23,250 are not eligible for financial support.</p> <p>The value of an individual's home is not taken into account while they are living there. If they moved into a residential or nursing placement, the value of their home may then be taken into account, depending on who continued to live there.</p> <p>If the care and support costs exceed an individual's Personal Budget (for example, if the Personal Budget is set at a level at which their needs could be met in an appropriate residential or nursing placement but they chose to receive care and support at home at a higher cost), this could lead to financial hardship.</p>	<p>The value of an individual's home would not be taken into account if the individual moved in to a residential or nursing placement if the individual's partner or relative aged over 65 or under 18 continued to live there.</p> <p>In each case, the council would consider whether there were any exceptional reasons to take into account when setting the Personal Budget and this would include a consideration of any impact on the individual's wellbeing.</p> <p>Individuals would, where appropriate, be signposted to Independent Financial Advice about funding care and support costs.</p> <p>An Independent Financial Advisor would be able to advise on the impact of options on the adult social care financial assessment (for</p>

		<p>example, whether the value of a property would be taken into account if an individual moved into residential or nursing care). The Southampton Information Directory would also be updated to include links to information on funding care provided by Age UK, Mencap and other relevant charities and support organisations.</p> <p>A phased introduction of this proposal is also being considered to help mitigate any adverse effects.</p>
<p><b>Other Significant Impacts</b></p>	<p>No identified negative impacts at this stage, although this will be kept under review as the consultation progresses.</p>	

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<p><b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b></p>	<p><b>TRANS 1- Digital Transformation Programme.</b></p> <p>The Digital Transformation Programme will transform the way that our customers interact with us and how our employees work with us through increased and better use of technology. This will involve changing the way staff work and increasing the amount of services which can be reported, paid for or applied for online. There will also be improvements made to how information from customers is processed, to increase efficiency and improve customer service.</p>
<p><b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b></p>	<p>All residents, customers, employees, strategic partners and businesses could be affected by the Digital Transformation Programme.</p> <p>Potentially this may mean that all 245,000 residents are affected by the changes as well as businesses operating within Southampton boundaries.</p>
<p><b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b></p>	<p>The Digital Transformation Programme has potential impacts on all our customers, employees and partners. We are moving towards a position of digital by default for contact with the council. This means contact with the council will be online in the main; we will provide support to those customer who really need it, to help them access online services.</p> <p>For the majority - our customers and employees who are already used to using online services- the move to digital by preference with simple and easy to access transactions will have a positive impact.</p>

	<p>For those who are not online or who find technology difficult, we will offer assistance and support to help them transact with the council to minimise any negative impact. The programme will make improvements to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reporting issues to the council</li> <li>- Paying for services from the council</li> <li>- Applying for services or support from the council.</li> </ul>
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	<p>The digital programme will enable residents to receive quicker and improved services from the council and allow them to access services online at a time that suits them.</p> <p>The majority of Southampton residents are able to use online services and digital technology such as smart phones and tablets in their everyday life. We will be expanding the range of services available online and giving residents a quick and convenient way to report, request, pay and apply for services from the council by digital means.</p>
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Helen Seward
<b>Date</b>	4 <sup>th</sup> November 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Jon Dyer-Slade
<b>Date</b>	5 <sup>th</sup> November 2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	<p>Younger people are likely to be more digitally ready and therefore able to adapt to a digital council.</p> <p>Older people may be less digitally capable and therefore may need assistance to move to digital.</p> <p>For individuals of any age, it is anticipated that customers will receive a higher level of customer service.</p>	<p>We will target our communications to those groups who need support and encouragement to go digital. We will enable digital self-service with assistance for those most vulnerable groups.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	<p>Some of those with disabilities may not be able to access all services digitally.</p>	<p>Assisted self-serve will be available for the most vulnerable groups.</p>



<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Employees on maternity and paternity leave may find keeping in touch with the organisation becomes simpler while they are away from the organisation.	Improved digital access to council systems will make it easier for employees to keep informed about relevant issues.
<b>Race</b>	People whose first language is not English, may have reduced confidence around using digital.	Customers can use third party online services to translate web content and interpretation services will still be provided for those deemed most vulnerable.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No community safety impacts identified.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Those with little or no disposable income may find it difficult to purchase IT equipment and access the internet.	The council will continue to provide free access to the internet in locations such as libraries and housing offices.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>HOU 5</b> - To review the use of incentive payments for council tenants who are downsizing to better target tenants who need to move to accessible property or to supported housing for older people.
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>A payment of £850 (plus a contribution towards moving costs for those moving to older person’s accommodation) is granted to council tenants moving as incentive for them to move out of larger accommodation that they no longer require.</p> <p>This has been operating successfully for a number of years releasing a significant number of family homes for those who need them. 59 council tenants who have downsized in the first 6 months of the year.</p> <p>The payment is no longer needed to act as an incentive, as families with spare rooms are seeking to move. The allocation policy provides a high priority to enable households in such circumstances to move and this is be retained.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	<p>The need to offer financial incentives has reduced with other changes e.g. reduction in Housing Benefit where households under occupy.</p> <p>Retaining a more targeted use of the incentive for older people moving into supported housing and households who have a need for accessible homes enables larger homes to continue to be freed up for families.</p>
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	The current incentive is given without reference to the financial circumstances of the household, reviewing its use will give the opportunity to create parity with other council tenant households who move and is more

	consistent with how other social landlord incentive payments operate.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Liz Slater
<b>Date</b>	28/10/2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Nick Cross
<b>Date</b>	05/11/2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	Older people occupy homes larger than they need in greater numbers than other households.	The ability to assist older people into specified older person's accommodation will be retained.
<b>Disability</b>	Disabled households living in adapted homes that they are under occupying need to move to smaller adapted homes.	The incentives will be retained for households in this circumstance. Freeing up homes with adaptations not needed by the tenant households will create more vacancies for disabled people.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Families affected by the reduction in Housing Benefit where they have spare	The priority awarded to downsizing households will still apply, enabling a

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	bedrooms will lose the right to the incentive payment.	quicker move to a smaller home. This allows families to better manage their finances in terms of lower rent. A flexible approach to rent debt will also be applied to facilitate moving while repayment continues.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>HOU 19 - Increasing garage rents for private residents renting a council garage by £1 a week.</b>
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	The council provides in the region of 1000 garages across the city. There are a number of garages across the city that are rented by individuals who are not council tenants.
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	This proposal will impact on 370 individuals, who will see the charge for their garage rent increase by £1 per week from April 2016. There is the potential that some individuals may give up their garage.
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	Increase in income - to the Housing and Revenue Account to enable to improve services.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Steve Smith Housing Services Manager
<b>Date</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Nick Cross Head of Housing Services
<b>Date</b>	28 October 2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>	Increase in number of garages empty if residents decide that this increase is significant and will not agree to make the increased rent.	Use of any waiting list for people wanting garages in any areas where vacancies occur. Advertise vacancies if not waiting list.



## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<p><b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b></p>	<p><b>HOU 20 - Supported Services:</b> Increase in charges to private tele/CAREline customers.</p>
<p><b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b></p>	<p>The CAREline Alarm provides an emergency telecare alarm service 24 hours a day, every day of the year to any resident living in Southampton.</p> <p>It is a personal alarm button, which can be worn as a necklace or a wrist strap at home. In an emergency, when you press the button, it automatically dials the CAREline service. It is for use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at any age</li> <li>• if there are long term health needs</li> <li>• for older people and the elderly frail</li> <li>• people with a disability</li> </ul> <p><b>Costs and Services:</b> The setup fee includes demonstration of the alarm unit, installation and advice from CAREline staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £10 plus VAT if you live within Southampton</li> <li>• £20 plus VAT If you live outside the city.</li> </ul> <p>After set up two levels of service are offered:</p> <p><b>Silver service – monitoring:</b> This service is available to anyone within a 20 mile radius of Southampton. The service contacts a keyholder.</p> <p><b>Gold service - monitoring and response:</b> Gold service</p>

	<p>is only available to residents living within the Southampton. A professional team of CAREline responders, employed by Southampton City Council, will be sent to visit where appropriate to the emergency.</p> <p>There are 554 silver tele/CAREline customers and 1233 gold tele/CAREline customers.</p> <p>Current charges are £2.50 per week for Silver and £3.50 per week for Gold. Charges have not been increased since 2005.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	<p>The proposal is to increase the charge for this service. This could potentially increase the risk of financial hardship on vulnerable residents.</p> <p>It may also result in customers terminating this service leading to increased risks in terms of health and safety in the home and peace of mind for relatives / carers.</p>
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	Increase in income to fund and develop the service.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Jean Brown
<b>Date</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Nick Cross
<b>Date</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	This is a targeted service - for older people and elderly frail.	
<b>Disability</b>	This is a targeted service - for disabled people.	
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Increase in charge.	Proposed charges are still within the average local market rate. Charges kept below the rate of inflation as no increases since 2005.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>	Reduction in number of customers and subsequent effect on other services e.g. Health and Social Care.	Marketing and promotion of the benefits of the service.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>HOU 21 - Supported Services:</b> Introduction of a new charging model to better identify the individual service elements for Community Alarm customers within Southampton City Council Supported Housing accommodation (i.e. monitoring, maintenance and responding).
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	The Community Alarm Service is provided via a hard wired alarm and pull chord system within the home. Currently, 3,300 Southampton City Council tenants receive this service. The current charge for this service is a flat fee of £1.25 per week (since 2009). The proposal is to introduce a new charging model of £1.25per week monitoring, £0.85per week maintenance, £0.75per week responding.
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	The proposal will have a financial impact with the potential for increased financial hardship for vulnerable residents. Let-ability of properties could be affected.
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	This would increase the income to fund and develop the service and to more accurately reflect the real cost of providing the service. It would also enable the service to be extended to: give residents within (aged) 50 and 60 plus blocks, the option of choosing the responding service.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Jean Brown
<b>Date</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Nick Cross
<b>Date</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2015

**Potential Impact**

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	This is a targeted service - for older people and elderly frail.	
<b>Disability</b>	This is a targeted service - for disabled people.	
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Increase in charge.	Proposed charges are still within the average local market rate. Charges kept below the rate of inflation as no increases since 2009. Maintenance charge is Housing Benefit eligible The responding service is optional for 50/60 plus blocks.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		



## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<p><b>HOU 24</b> - Removal of cash collection facility at Woolston Housing Office.</p> <p><b>HOU 26</b> - Removal of cash collection facility at Shirley Housing Office.</p>
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>In January 2011, the Housing Management Division restructured with the aim of taking the service into the local neighbourhood by having housing staff out and about more on their ‘patch’ recognising issues before they become a problem. This decision necessitated the closure of several cash collection facilities.</p> <p>To mitigate the impact, PayPoint cards were introduced allowing payments to be made at local outlets and now over 30% of tenants pay by this method and a similar percentage pay by Direct Debit.</p> <p>Since the reorganisation, further closures have taken place leaving only Peartree and Shirley Local Housing Offices available to take cash payments. Around 25% of tenants eligible to pay rent, after housing benefits have been taken into account, still utilise one of these offices. Currently, the cash collection facility is available between 8.30am to 4pm daily (Peartree is closed on Wednesdays).</p> <p>The numbers of payers fluctuates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Peartree the number people paying rent a month is in the region of 1,250-1,500 and the number of people paying Council Tax is in the region of 800 per month.</li> <li>• For Shirley the number of people paying rent a</li> </ul>

	<p>month is in the region of 3,500 – 4,000 and the number of people paying Council Tax is in the region of 2,000 – 2,500 per month.</p> <p>They also deal with a range of other enquiries.</p> <p>The proposal is to cease cash counter facilities at Woolston from April 2016 following the move from Peartree Local housing Office to the new Woolston Library. Cash collection services in Shirley Local Housing Office will also be removed from April 2017.</p>
<p><b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b></p>	<p>The proposal to close Peartree cash office in 2016 and Shirley cash office in 2017 is under consideration due to budget pressures but also fits in with the wider Council transformation strategy of digital by default. The closure of the remaining Housing cash collection facilities will inevitably have an effect on a large number of customers both Council tenants and Council Tax payers. However previous experience has shown that when one payment avenue is closed then payers migrate to other options. It is incumbent on the Income Services team to manage this transition smoothly through good communication providing information on other options.</p> <p>After previous closures of Local Housing Office cash facilities, there was a partial rise in non-cash based enquiries to other Council facilities such as Gateway.</p> <p>However, these proposals do not change the key point of contact for Housing enquiries from tenants from Local Housing Teams and therefore it is not anticipated this proposal will have any significant impact on Gateway. However we will ensure that steps are taken to provide customers with as much information as possible as to best alternatives such as direct telephone numbers for particular enquiries.</p>



<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	<p>PayPoint provides tenants with a flexible and convenient method of payment. All other payment options are cheaper than the face to face transactional model and given that we will inevitably see an exponential rise in transactions as Universal Credit is phased in and direct Housing Benefit payments (of some £35 Million per annum) are phased out, this change will mitigate the extra transactional costs.</p> <p>The changes should assist in the Council's ability to maintain a focus on personal contact with individual tenants to understand their concerns. It is also an opportunity for Income team to respond to those affected by the change and not only provide options on alternative payment methods but also use the conversations wisely by providing advice on welfare changes that may impact on the tenant.</p>
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Mike Carey
<b>Date</b>	27/10/2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Nick Cross
<b>Date</b>	05/11/2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	The reduction in opening hours may have an effect on elderly tenants who do not have a PayPoint outlet in the vicinity although this is unlikely given there is a wide geographical spread of over 100 outlets identifiable by a PP sign outside the shop.	Tenants will be issued with new PayPoint cards along with a list of outlets in their vicinity. They will also be informed of other ways in which to pay their rent including on-line, by telephone or Direct Debits.
<b>Disability</b>	The reduction in opening hours may have an effect on tenants with a physical disability or impairment who do not have a PayPoint outlet in the vicinity although this is unlikely given there is a wide geographical spread of over 100 outlets	Tenants will be issued with new PayPoint cards along with a list of outlets in their vicinity. They will also be informed of other ways in which to pay their rent including on-line, by telephone or Direct

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
	identifiable by a PP sign outside the shop.	Debits.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No particular impact on rent payments but may have a slight impact on those seeking advice.	Need to ensure that signs and posters include consideration of language barriers and give clear indication of other ways to pay with contact numbers for other services.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	Could be perceived as a reduction in the ability to discuss neighbour problems.	More use of telephones and home visits. Greater opportunity for Housing staff to spend time on the estates dealing with incidences of anti-social behaviour particularly at a lower level.
<b>Poverty</b>	Could be perceived as a reduction in the ability to discuss financial issues face to face.	Greater opportunity for Income Services staff to make home visits/hold surgeries and provide advice on benefits and welfare advice to tenants suffering financial exclusion. This is particularly important given the ongoing roll-out of welfare reform changes.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		

## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<p><b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b></p>	<p><b>HOU 34</b> - To withdraw the printed version of Tenants’ Link quarterly magazine for Council tenants and leaseholders.</p> <p>To replace with an annual summer edition combining the annual report and other highlights. To develop an online magazine for tenants and more regular news bulletins through “Stay Connected”.</p>
<p><b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b></p>	<p>Tenants’ Link is currently delivered quarterly to all 17,000 Council tenants and 1,800 leaseholders across the city. It contains items of local area/estate news, and information about the Housing service and service developments, tenant involvement opportunities, programmed work to our properties, estate regeneration, and the Supported Housing service. It also gives financial and welfare benefit advice, and some health promotion advice.</p>
<p><b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b></p>	<p>Tenant focus groups and surveys have informed the Council that the magazine is popular and well read. The Council will continue to make similar information available through developing an online magazine, and making better use of “Stay Connected” – the council’s free email alert service. However the proposal is likely to have an impact on those customers who do not currently have online access.</p> <p>To mitigate against this, the proposal is to continue to produce an annual paper version of the magazine. Housing Services already has a focus on digital inclusion, and has a number of initiatives in place, including tenant digital champions, and IT drop ins. The intention is, following analysis of our 2015 survey of tenant digital inclusion to develop a programme of events and</p>

	initiatives to encourage tenants to get online.
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	<p>The popularity of Tenants' Link will act as a lever to help us encourage our tenants to get online in order that they can still access the information.</p> <p>Making greater use of "Stay Connected" alerts and bulletins will enable us to make sure that information out to our customers is current, rather than contacting them only once a quarter. It will allow greater flexibility with our communications.</p>
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Jane Samuels
<b>Date</b>	23 October 2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Nick Cross
<b>Date</b>	05 November 2015

### Potential Impact

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	Older people are less frequent users of online services.	Further developing the IT drop ins that already take place in supported housing complexes across the city, as well as developing a programme of initiatives and training for tenants generally to support them to get online.
<b>Disability</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Belief</b>		
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Home computer ownership is known to be less amongst the social housing population due to poverty.	Stay Connected alerts can be received on mobile phone. Our training initiatives to support customers to get online will focus on areas of greatest need as identified in our tenants online survey and will cover housing tenants in the most deprived areas of the city.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

<b>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</b>	<b>HOU 35</b> - To withdraw the printed version of Homebid magazine, the fortnightly vacancy listing of social housing for applicants on the council’s housing waiting list.
<b>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</b>	<p>Homebid is the council’s choice-choice based lettings system. It is currently available on-line and in printed magazine format.</p> <p>The Homebid magazine is currently published and distributed to council offices (Gateway, Local Housing Offices, and libraries) for clients and agency staff to collect. The magazine lists council vacant housing properties and those of the major housing associations operating in the city, from which applicants can select properties they are interested in and express this by bidding for these homes.</p> <p>The Council currently distributes 1,900 copies of each publication and it is used consistently by agencies who support clients with vulnerabilities. There are currently 10,000 active applicants on the waiting list all of whom are in housing need and who use the magazine to find vacancies.</p>
<b>Summary of Impact and Issues</b>	<p>The council was early in its move to a choice-based letting system and opted to provide a printed magazine version as part of this. Many areas that have moved over more recently have opted to only provide online only.</p> <p>This proposal will have an impact on those who do not currently have access to online services. A new printable flyer which can be tailored to individual applicant needs is being developed which will be introduced in advance of the withdrawal of the magazine. This will enable people to search for, select and print off a</p>

	<p>personalised selection of the properties they are interested in bidding for.</p> <p>Agencies who support clients with vulnerabilities will be briefed on the changes and will be able to print flyers for clients.</p> <p>There will also be a mechanism, based on need, to enable automated bidding.</p> <p>Free computer access is available eg Gateway in various locations in the city.</p>
<b>Potential Positive Impacts</b>	The current number of on-line bids made by Homebid applicants is the majority of customers and the move to the website printable flyer will increase their levels of confidence and skills with on-line service access.
<b>Responsible Service Manager</b>	Liz Slater
<b>Date</b>	29/10/2015

<b>Approved by Senior Manager</b>	Nick Cross
<b>Date</b>	05/11/2015

**Potential Impact**

<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Age</b>	There is a significant number of older people seeking housing and they are less frequent users of on-line services.	The system allows for targeted automated bidding assistance for those unable to access on-line. Staff identify clients who can benefit from this and clients themselves can request this.
<b>Disability</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Race</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Religion or</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A



<b>Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Details of Impact</b>	<b>Possible Solutions &amp; Mitigating Actions</b>
<b>Belief</b>		
<b>Sex</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Community Safety</b>	No identified negative impacts.	N/A
<b>Poverty</b>	Home computer ownership is known to be less amongst the social housing population due to poverty.	A phone application is being developed to widen the opportunities for applicants and automated bidding is in place for those without any access.
<b>Other Significant Impacts</b>		

**This page is intentionally left blank**