

Cabinet

DOCUMENTS FOR THE MEMBERS ROOM

Wednesday, 29th November,
2023 at 4.00 pm

MEMBERS ROOM DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO THE
LISTED REPORTS

Contacts

Cabinet Administrator

Judy Cordell

Tel: 023 8083 2766

Email: judy.cordell@southampton.gov.uk

MEMBERS ROOM DOCUMENTS

11 BUDGET MATTERS - MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY UPDATE
(Pages 1 - 86)

Tuesday, 21 November
2023

1 "
2 "



**Budget Proposals 2024/25
Equality and Safety
Cumulative Impact Assessment**

November 2023

Equality and Safety Cumulative Impact Assessment

Introduction

1. Southampton City Council, in line with its statutory responsibilities, undertakes Equality and Safety Impact Assessments (ESIAs). ESIAs provide a systematic way of assessing the impact of policies, strategies, programmes, projects, services or functions on different equality groups - and on poverty and community safety. During the council's annual budget cycle, ESIAs are completed for all proposals identified as requiring them to inform decision making.
2. This document draws into one place a summary of all the ESIAs for the 2024/25 February budget proposals. This assessment focuses on service-based proposals identified as having a direct impact on customers/residents and which will impact on the budget position for the council for the 2023/24 financial year.
3. It is important to fully understand the impact of the budget proposals on equality groups (identified in paragraph 11) and on community safety, poverty and health and wellbeing. The council, working with others, will need to take action to mitigate the collective impact of any such proposals. Mitigating actions could include re-shaping services to target more efficiently and to reduce the potential of disproportionate impacts on equalities groups, community safety, poverty and health and wellbeing.

Context

4. Over recent years, Southampton City Council has had to change significantly in response to ongoing changes in the city's profile, trends in customer behaviour, national and local policies and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and cost of living crisis. This has been accompanied by ongoing challenges in the shape of rising demand in adults and children's social care.
5. The Covid-19 pandemic has left an impact on the city and its residents which is shown in increased pressures on adult social care, looked after children and waiting list backlogs across public services. Southampton City Council played a critical role in helping to lead the local response to the pandemic. It continues to support residents, communities and businesses with the recovery.
6. The cost of living crisis is now impacting on residents in the city. It refers to a decline in 'real' income (adjusted for inflation) experienced in the UK since late 2021. The consumer price index (CPI) inflation rate rose by 6.7% in the 12 months to August 2023, down from 6.8% in July 2023. Due to high inflation rate the Bank of England have increased interest rates to 5.25% August 2023 up from 1.25% in August 2022. Although rising costs will affect all, it is expected that more deprived households are experiencing poorer outcomes.
7. It is against this backdrop that decisions are being made about increasing fees and charges across a range of services due to rising costs faced by Southampton City Council whilst recognising the deep impact the cost of living crisis is having on residents. The council is providing support in partnership with other providers, and has put together an [online Cost of Living guide](#) to what is available from the community and Government.

8. This Cumulative Impact Assessment covers the budget proposals for the financial year 2023/24 which are being reported to Cabinet in November 2023 and will be proposed subject to the outcome of the consultation to Full Council in February 2024.
9. This Cumulative Impact Assessment also includes other consultations that have taken place across the council services that may not directly impact the budget but collectively could have a cumulative impact on our identified protected characteristic groups, those additional consultations are
 - [City Centre On & Off-Street Tariff Changes - \(City Centre\) \(Amendment 2\) Order 2023 & \(Off-Street Parking Places\) \(Amendment 1\) Order 2023](#)
 - [Simplify the Itchen Bridge tariff](#)
 - Adult Social Care Charging Policy
 - Holcroft House
 - School Travel Service Policy

Legal Framework – Equalities

10. The Public Sector Equality Duty, section 149 of the Equality Act, came into effect on 5th April 2011 and places a duty on all public bodies and others carrying out public functions.
11. The Public Sector Equality Duty (the Equality Duty) replaced three previous public sector equality duties – for race, disability and gender, and broadened the breadth of protected characteristics to include:
 - Age
 - Disability
 - Gender reassignment
 - Marriage and civil partnership, but only in respect of the requirements to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination.
 - Pregnancy and maternity
 - Race – ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality
 - Religion or Belief – including lack of belief
 - Sex
 - Sexual orientation.
12. The Act was designed to ensure public bodies consider the needs of all individuals in their day to day work, including: shaping policy, delivering services and employment of employees. It requires public bodies, such as local councils not to discriminate against any person on the basis of a protected characteristic such as disability. The legislation strengthened existing provisions about discrimination to also include associative and perceptive discrimination as well as direct and indirect discrimination.
13. Direct discrimination occurs when a rule, policy or practice offers less favourable treatment to a group and indirect discrimination occurs by introducing a rule, policy or practice that applies to everyone but particularly disadvantages people who have a protected characteristic. Direct discrimination will always be unlawful. Indirect discrimination will not be unlawful if it can be justified, for instance it can be shown that the rule, policy or practice was intended to meet a legitimate objective in a fair, balanced and reasonable way.

14. In considering whether or not any indirect discrimination is justified, the council must consider whether or not there is any other way to meet their objective that is not discriminatory or is less likely to disadvantage those with protected characteristics. This may well mean setting out clearly whether or not consideration has been given to other ways of achieving these objectives.
15. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality and Safety Impact Assessment, rather it requires public bodies to demonstrate their consideration of the Equality Duty and the conscious thought of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making. This entails an understanding of the potential effect the organisation's activities could have on different people and a record of how decisions were reached. Producing an Equality and Safety Impact Assessment post decision making is non-compliant with the Public Sector Equality Duty. For this reason the council requires adherence to the existing impact assessment framework.

Legal Framework - Community Safety

16. Community Safety is a broad term. It refers to the protection of local communities from the threat and consequence of criminal and anti-social behaviour by achieving reductions in relation to both crime and the fear of crime.
17. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, as amended by the Police and Justice Act 2006, requires responsible authorities to consider crime and disorder, including antisocial behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment; and the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in the exercise of all their duties, activities and decision-making. This means consideration must be given to the likely impact on crime and disorder in the development of any policies, strategies and service delivery. This responsibility affects all employees of the council.

Other considerations

18. In line with the [Southampton Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2017-2025](#) the council has committed to ensuring that health inequalities are taken into account in policy development, commissioning and service delivery. This means that consideration will be given to impacts on health and wellbeing in the ESIA's.
19. In March 2023 Full Council passed a motion that Southampton City Council will treat care experience in a similar manner to a protected characteristic so that future services and policies made and adopted by the Council should be assessed through equality impact assessments, which have been updated to include consideration of care experienced to determine the impact of changes on people with care experience, alongside those who share a Protected Characteristic.
20. The council's approach on assessing the impact of its policies, proposals and decisions, is designed to demonstrate that it has acted over and above its statutory duties. This is reflected in including poverty in the ESIA, as the council is committed to addressing the impact on poverty for people in work and unemployed and for other low-income households.
21. The ESIA's also consider any other significant impacts that exist in relation to the proposal and decision.

Scope and our approach

22. This assessment identifies those proposals as well as those in the budget where there is a risk that changes resulting from individual proposals, may have, when considered together, negative impacts on particular groups.
23. It is important to note this is an ongoing process. As individual budget proposals are developed and implemented, they will be subject to further assessment. This assessment also describes mitigating actions that will need to be considered.
24. This Cumulative Impact Assessment reflects the latest assessment of impacts of the relevant budget proposals.

City Profile

25. The most recent data available for the population of Southampton is from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) Census which took place on 21 March 2021. In Southampton, the population size has increased by 5.1%, from around 236,882 in 2011 to 248,922 in 2021. This is lower than the overall increase for England of 6.6%. Southampton ranked 70th for total population size out of 309 local authority areas in 2021. This is the same position it held a decade ago in 2011.
26. Although the overall population has increased, there are variations by age group within the city:
 - There was a decrease of 10.5% in the under 5 years population between 2011 (15,407) and 2021 (13,795) which is reflective of decreasing birth rates locally and nationally,
 - The population aged 5 to 14 has increased by 20.9% to 28,288,
 - The population aged 15 to 24 has decreased by 9.4% which reflects the reduced student residency in the city during the pandemic
 - The number of people aged 65 to 84 has increased by 13.7% reflecting the aging population.
27. The number of households in Southampton increased from 98,254 in 2011 to 102,294 in Census 2021, an increase of 4.1%. Further detailed census data relating to protected characteristics will be issued by the ONS between now and summer 2023.
28. Data in the Southampton City Council Statement of Accounts 2022 show:
 - 6,920 (3.8%) working age residents are claiming Job Seekers Allowance or work-related Universal Credit as of May 2022.
 - There are 109,210 properties in the city with 48.8% owner occupied, 21.9% private rented and 29.3% social rented (figure for properties comes from VOA) details of tenure is from Census 2021)
 - The council provide 16,352 council houses as of April 2022
29. The Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) provide another range of data about the city. This focuses on the geographical profile of poverty but there is also a link between equality strands and risk factors for poverty. The most recent IMD was published in 2019 and is largely based on data from 2015/16. This indicates that, since the last IMD published in 2015, Southampton has become relatively less deprived compared to other places in the country. Of the 317 local authorities in England, Southampton is

now ranked 55th most deprived, compared to 54th in IMD 2015 where 1 is the most deprived.

**Table1:
Budget Proposals: Impact By Protected Characteristics, Community Safety, Health and Wellbeing and Poverty.**

Description of Proposal	Age	Disability	Gender Reassignment	Marriage & Civil Partnership	Pregnancy & Maternity	Race	Religion & Belief	Sex	Sexual Orientation	Community Safety	Poverty	Care Experienced	Health & Wellbeing	Other
Adult Social Care Charging Policy	X	X									X			
Holcroft House	X	X									X		X	X
School Travel Service Policy	X	X												
City Centre On and Off-Street Changes		X									X			
Removal of the off-peak classification from the Itchen Bridge toll											X			
Additional Council Tax premium for properties empty more than 12 months - legislation dependent														X
Introduce additional Council Tax premium for second homes - legislation dependent														x
HRA – Landlord Controlled Heating											X		X	
HRA – Rental increases											X	X	X	

Age

30. People in later life may be more likely to use some council services and so may be more vulnerable than the general population to reductions or changes in those services. This vulnerability will be worsened for those living on low incomes. Some older people may feel the impact of several proposals.
31. The cost of living crisis is also impacting on specific age groups disproportionately with proposals related to price increases having a further cumulative impact. Mosaic groups have been analysed in terms of this impact with the following being the top 3 in Southampton most vulnerable to rising costs:
- Family Basics – families with limited resources who budget to make ends meet. Predominantly 26-35/36-45 year olds. 31% have 2 children, most of which are 5-11yrs old. They have low discretionary income
 - Municipal Tenants – mainly 46-55/56-65 year olds. Renting high density housing from social landlords. They are often single and on low household incomes. 84% do not have children
 - Vintage Value – over 66 years old with a household income lower than £15,000 and often living in fuel poverty.
32. The proposals relating Adult Social Care Charging Policy and Holcroft House have an impact on age.
33. **Adult Social Care charging policy** Southampton City Council is proposing to make changes to the charging policy affecting 2,654 customers with one or more current package of care, the main changes are:
- Overhaul of the process for managing people's disability-related expenses
 - Changing the way we charge for care which is cancelled
 - Clarifying the timing of charges when care first starts
 - Changing the method for calculating the cost of non-residential care, from an average rate to the actual cost
 - Introducing charges for transport
 - Increasing the administration charges for processing deferred payment loans
 - Changing the rate used for the "Minimum Income Guarantee" for new customers aged between 60 and state pension age
 - Improvements to the general structure and accessibility of the ASC Charging policy document
34. We have identified the following impacts:
- the age breakdown for adult social care customers is 44% aged 18-64 and 56% aged 65 and over.
 - Older people may be unable to access the new charging policy online.
 - Change 7 (Changing the rate used for the "Minimum Income Guarantee" for new customers aged between 60 and state pension age) will directly impact new customers aged 60 to pension age.
35. We have identified the following mitigating actions:
- Hard copies of the policy will be available on request and the initial letters sent to customers will include a phone number and email address to use for requesting hard copies.

- Customers who find their charges unaffordable can consider claiming disability-related expenses (DREs), or appealing the outcome of their financial assessment.
- The Care Act requires that the council does not charge anyone more than they can afford, and in applying the proposed changes to the policy, this principle does not change.

36. **Holcroft House:** The decision was made by Cabinet on 19th September to close Holcroft House a 34 bedroom residential home providing short and long term care for adults living with dementia. There are currently 14 long term residents and 4 temporary residents. A Fire Safety Assessment (FSA) has identified a number of issues that will need addressing at Holcroft House whereby residents will need to relocate during the works over a period of 18 months. Funds were initially identified for the initial work but costs have since increased exponentially and additional work identified in relation to asbestos bringing the current estimations to over £1m, with potential for that to increase.

37. We have identified the following impact:

- The greatest impact will be on those older service users who have been using Holcroft for many years, all of the residents are over 65.

38. We have identified the following mitigating actions:

- Needs assessments and reviews will take place for all residents prior to any changes. Through this process information on alternatives will be made available. Where changes need to be made, a gradual approach will be taken to support those who will be most affected.
- Advocacy services are in place to help support the individuals and ensure that the move is in their best interest.
- Individual transition plans will be produced and updated. Where necessary other professionals and agencies will be called upon to support the individual to minimise any impact.
- There is adequate residential and non-residential provision in or near the boundary of the city.

39. **School Travel Service and Post-16 Travel Service Policy 2024-25**, the proposed changes to the policy are:

- Wording amended to ensure terminology is consistent and more accurately reflects the service offer. This is in line with the service's rebrand from 'Home to School Travel' to 'School Travel Service'.
- Addition of a clear hierarchy of travel support options.
- Additional information on the appeals process.
- Requirement for parents who wish to apply for travel support to list their nearest suitable school on their school application form.

40. We have identified the following impact:

- This School Travel Service policy impacts children of compulsory school age, post-16 students and adult learners (up to age 25 where they are continuing on a course started before their 19th birthday). Travel support will be provided in line with statutory duties.

41. We have identified the following mitigating actions:

- No change to policy or provision.

Disability

42. According to the Equality Act 2010, a person has a disability if he or she has a physical or mental impairment which has a long term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out day to day activities. People with a disability may be impacted more by some of the proposals compared to those without a disability, with mitigating actions proposed to help address this.

43. People with a disability can face additional living costs. Research by the charity Scope shows life costs £583 more on average a month if you are disabled. For 24% of families with disabled children extra costs can amount to £1,000 a month. Any proposal which increases costs therefore have the potential to have a more acute impact on a person with a disability.

44. **Holcroft House.** We have identified the following impact:

- All residents have a cognitive impairment and a number also have a physical impairment.
- The proposal may have either a positive or negative impact depending on the individual and the extent to which they prefer current models of service.
- Those with physical disabilities may experience a larger impact due to some of the alternative options not having the equipment to be able to support appropriately and being able to accommodate in private sector, however, this will be no different to our internal homes.

45. We have identified the following mitigating action:

- Any proposed move will be considered carefully taking into account the persons best interests and their and their families' wishes and feelings. Any move will ensure that the individual's assessed eligible needs for care and support are met, including ensuring they have appropriate equipment.
- There is adequate residential provision in or near the boundary of the city. Residents and their carers will be supported to identify the most appropriate alternative option which meets their physical needs.

46. **Adult Social Care Charging Policy.** We have identified the following impact:

- 60.4% of adult social care customers are claiming a disability benefit (disability living allowance, attendance allowance or personal independence payments)
- The overhaul of the process for disability-related benefits (change 1) is therefore relevant to most of our customers.
- Disabled people are most likely to require council-arranged transport and will therefore be affected by plans to start charging the cost of transport (see change 5). However, disabled customers who are only paying a contribution towards the cost of their care, will not be affected by this.

47. We have identified the following mitigating action:

- Many disabled customers claim a mobility component to their disability benefit which is intended to be used to help with the additional cost of transport. In addition, free and low-cost community transport services are available.

48. **Implementing a standard parking charging period to On street and Off street car parks**, the proposal is to implement a standard parking charge period of Monday to Sunday 8am to 8pm (on-street) and Monday to Sunday 8am to Midnight (off-street), the implementation of increased on-street and off-street parking tariffs, the removal of 10 minute free charging periods (except from St. Marys Road and Compton Walk) and the changing of St. Marys Road P&D Bays to cars only.

49. We have identified the following impact:

- Possible impact on people with mobility issues who do not qualify for a Blue Badge.

50. We have identified the following mitigating actions:

- Range of parking location options and tariffs available across the City Centre. Potential to review.

51. **School Travel Service and Post-16 Travel Service Policy 2024-25**, We have identified the following impact:

- Southampton City Council will provide travel support for all children of compulsory school age who cannot be expected to walk to school or travel independently by reason of their Special Educational Need and/or Disability (SEND), to the nearest most appropriate school based on their needs, in line with the council's statutory duties.
- Travel support for post-16 students and adult learners (up to age 25 where they are continuing on a course started before their 19th birthday) with Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities will be provided based on assessed need. Students and/or their parents/carers will not be required to contribute towards the cost of this service.
- Where a child lives within walking distance of the nearest qualifying school (or designated school if it is not the nearest) but the route to school relies on parent/carer with a disability accompanying that child for it to be considered safe, and the parent/carer's disability prevents them from doing so, the child will be eligible for school travel free of charge. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis, with medical evidence of the parent's disability requiring confirmation.

52. We have identified the following mitigating actions:

- No change to policy or provision

Poverty

53. **Adult Social Care Charging Policy.** The relative poverty of our customers has been assessed using the ONS Combined Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019. The index indicates the level of deprivation in the local area someone lives in, based on multiple factors including income. This is the deprivation profile for Southampton residents overall – figures show the percentage of people living in the most deprived areas, then the slightly less deprived areas etc:

- Top 20% most deprived: 28%
- Next 20%: 35%
- Next 20%: 19%
- Next 20%: 14%
- 20% least deprived: 4%

54. The profile for adult social care customers is similar overall, except for people in residential care. This group has much lower numbers in the most deprived areas and more people in the least deprived areas. Another ONS measure, the Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPi) was also checked. The results for the Southampton population were:
- Top 20% most deprived: 26%
 - Next 20%: 30%
 - Next 20%: 20%
 - Next 20%: 18%
 - 20% least deprived: 6%
55. Again, the pattern for our customers was similar, with the same exception for people in care homes. This difference between the IMD and IDAOPi profiles suggests that older people are overall slightly less deprived than the population as a whole.
56. The amount we charge for care has a significant effect on people with low incomes. However, all the changes being proposed have been carefully considered to ensure that no one is required to pay more than they can afford. The government-set minimum income guarantee (for people living at home) and personal expenses allowance (for people in care homes) ensure that people are left with sufficient income to cover their reasonable day-to-day living costs.
57. We have identified the following mitigating action:
- Customers who consider that they are being charged more than they can afford, can:
 - Claim disability-related expenses, to reduce their charges.
 - Request an updated financial assessment, if their income/ assets/ expenses have changed.
 - Appeal the outcome of their financial assessment.
 - Request that charges are waived, in exceptional circumstances.
58. **Holcroft House** The impact on this characteristic is the risk of additional costs to families or residents on alternative accommodation.
59. We have identified the following mitigating actions:
- Through the assessment process, we will consider the transport costs and any other costs as part of the care and support plan to move.
 - If families are unable to assist or cannot assist because of the person's needs, the council would look to meet the costs for transitioning across to new provision.
 - Where an individual is self-funding their current placement at Holcroft House, the council will meet statutory duties.
60. **Implementing a standard parking charging period to On street and Off street car parks**, We have identified the following impacts:
- Increase in parking tariffs for general users, City Centre residents and nighttime economy workers.
61. We have identified the following mitigating actions:
- Parking tariff increases are moderate and are reflective of inflation. City Centre residents have access to discounted season tickets. Nighttime economy workers have access to Overnight Season Ticket.
62. **Removal of the off-peak classification from the Itchen Bridge toll**, the proposal is to remove the off peak classification from the Itchen Bridge for vehicles in classes 2 and above who are not eligible for concessions. This will impact all users, whether using a smart card or paying in cash, who are driving cars, small vans and small 4x4.

63. Southampton Residents that receive a concessionary toll through use of a Smart Card will still have access to the discounted toll, but there will no longer be an off peak option. Southampton Residents who do not currently have a Smartcities card would need to apply for one in order to benefit from this discount.
64. The 2nd proposal is to increase the toll for Class 4 vehicles from £25 to £40 and the associated concession from £2 to £3.
65. We have identified the following impacts:
- This proposal may have a negative impact on users who need to travel to across the bridge to work or other reasons.
66. We have identified the following mitigating actions:
- Southampton Residents can access the concessionary toll via the Smart Cities card which still constitutes a significantly reduced rate.
67. **HRA - Rent Increase and Landlord Controlled Heating**, the proposals are
- Landlord Controlled Heating - During 2022/23 the Council's Landlord Controlled Heating Account was impacted by significantly increased energy costs. This resulted in a deficit of £3.6m. Charges were increased from April 2023, which has prevented the deficit from getting any worse, however a recovery plan is required to recover the deficit in a way that minimises impact on tenants. The proposal is to recover over a 5 year period, which will result in a n increase in charge of 6.5% in 2024/25, and an estimated 5% in 2025/6 and 2026/7, which will be subject to review when further energy cost forecasts are received. Taking no action is not sustainable financially.
 - Rental increases - Rent Increase for the 2024/25 financial year. It is necessary to increase rents to ensure a balanced Housing Revenue Account in 2024/25, to be able to continue to maintain homes through repairs and to ensure the capital programme is robust and provide additional capacity to invest to support improving the council's decent homes programme, and to ensure the long term sustainability of the business plan over the next 40 years. The maximum allowable increase under government legislation is 7.7%.
68. We have identified the following impacts:
- All proposals will have an impact on poverty as there are proposed increases in rents and service charges. Tenants and leaseholders will have increased housing and service charge costs.
 - In relation to heating charge increase those paying for the service will be impacted by an increase in charge.

Care Experienced

69. **HRA – Rent increase** we have identified the following impact
- There are 2 care leavers currently who are tenants who will be impacted by the rent increase but who will not be impacted by the service charge and rent increase proposals as they do not receive these services.
70. We have identified the following mitigating actions:
- If they are in receipt of benefits they will not be affected by the increase in rent. If they are not in receipt of benefits they can receive the additional support given from the Welfare Rights team within Housing.

Health and Wellbeing:

69. **Holcroft House** Residents' concerns and levels of anxiety could impact their emotional and physical wellbeing particularly just before and move or immediately afterwards. Relatives of residents may also have concerns relating to finding suitable alternate care and support which could impact their health and wellbeing.

70. We have identified the following mitigating actions:

- Needs assessments and reviews will take place for all residents prior to any changes taking place. Through this process information on alternatives will be made available.
- Individual transition plans will be produced and updated. This plan will include analysing the impact and where necessary other professionals and agencies will be called upon to support the individual to minimise any impact. Families/residents will be supported to review alternative placements and to under their particular needs, circumstances and preferences.

71. HRA – all proposals, we have identified the following impacts:

- In relation to health and wellbeing there may be an impact on households due to a reduction in income for households from the increase in rent, heating and service charge costs.

72. We have identified the following mitigating actions:

- Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent and service charges as these two benefits include rent and service charges costs.
- The Government have provided every household in the country with financial help towards their energy costs.

Other Significant Impacts

73. **Holcroft House** - Risk of reduced capacity within City for external Southampton residents requiring residential accommodation.

74. **Additional Council Tax premium for properties empty more than 12 months - legislation dependent and Introduce additional Council Tax premium for second homes - legislation dependent** - Increasing housing supply locally and bringing properties back into the currently short supply of local private rental sector has the potential to benefit a broad spectrum of groups who have protected characteristics. The proposals to introduce the council tax premiums for second homes and properties that have been empty for 12 months or more, could incentivise homeowners to release their properties onto the market, for either sale or rent. If offered for rent, this could help ease local housing pressures. The majority of the properties are in the lower council tax bands (A to C) so could help ease pressures in the private rented sector.

Other Protected Characteristics

75. We have identified no direct impacts for the following:

- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and Civil Partnership
- Pregnancy & Maternity
- Race
- Religion & Belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- Community Safety

Public Consultation

76. A programme of consultation will be undertaken between the between 23 November 2023 and 17 January 2024. Public consultation will be undertaken with residents. Southampton City Council is in a challenging financial position, at a time when demand for certain services such as adult and children's social care continues to increase, and residents face the impact of significant rising costs to everyday living. Therefore, the aim of this consultation is to:

- Communicate clearly and make residents aware of the financial pressures the council is facing.
- Ensure residents understand what is being proposed in the draft 2024/25 budget and are aware of what this will mean for them.
- Enable any resident, business or stakeholder who wishes to comment on the proposals the opportunity to do so, allowing them to raise any impacts the proposals may have.
- Ensure that the results are analysed in a meaningful, timely fashion, so that feedback is taken into account when final decisions are made.
- Provide feedback on the results to the consultation and how these results have influenced the final decision.

77. Every effort will be made to ensure consultation is:

- Inclusive: so that everyone in the city has the opportunity to express their views.
- Informative: so that people have adequate information about the proposals, what different options mean, and a balanced and fair explanation of the potential impacts, particularly the equality and safety impacts.
- Understandable: by ensuring that the language we use to communicate is simple and clear and that efforts are made to reach all stakeholders, for example people who are non-English speakers or disabled people.
- Appropriate: by targeting people who are more likely to be affected and using a more tailored approach to get their feedback, complemented by a general approach to all residents, staff, businesses and partners.
- Meaningful: by ensuring decision makers have the full consultation feedback information so they can make informed decisions.
- Reported: by letting consultees know what we have done with their feedback.

78. The consultation will be based around an online questionnaire and paper copies will also be made available.

79. This Cumulative Impact Assessment will be updated and developed based on the final proposals and detail of individual ESIAs. It will also be informed by the feedback from residents and stakeholders as part of the public budget consultation.

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 proposals and consider mitigating action.

Name or Brief Description of Proposal	Updates to the ASC Charging Policy starting April 2024 Consultation version
Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)	
<p>The provision of Adult Social Care (ASC) is regulated by the Care Act 2014, which includes statutory guidelines covering councils’ charging options for certain types of care.</p> <p>Southampton City Council (SCC, or the council) has an ASC Charging Policy which sets out what charges the Council will raise when arranging to meet a person's care and support needs, or a carer’s support needs.</p> <p>Changes are being proposed to a number of aspects of the existing ASC Charging Policy, affecting different sub-groups of customers. These changes are described below.</p> <p>The Care Act requires that we do not charge anyone more than they can afford, and in applying the proposed changes to the policy, this principle does not change.</p> <p><u>Customer breakdown</u></p> <p>As of 17th July 23, the council has 2,654 customers with one or more current packages of care arranged by or funded by the council. Of these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,659 are in non-residential care (care outside a care home) • 704 are receiving long-term (permanent) residential care (in a care home) • 49 are receiving occasional short-term/respite residential care • 242 are direct payment customers – people who are arranging their own care which is partially or wholly funded by the council. 	

Customers all have a “primary support reason” indicating the main reason they need care and support. This breaks down as follows:

- Learning Disability Support 21%
- Mental Health Support 13%
- Physical Support - Access and Mobility only 5%
- Physical Support - Personal Care support 49%
- Sensory Support - Support for Hearing Impairment <1%
- Sensory Support - Support for Visual Impairment <1%
- Social Support - Substance Misuse support 1%
- Support with Memory and Cognition 8%
- Other 1%

Of the 2,654 customers, approximately:

- 5% are paying the full cost of their care
- 71% are paying towards their care (the cost of the care or the maximum amount they can afford, whichever is lower)
- 12% are not paying anything towards their care because they have a very low income
- 11% are exempt from charging. (Of these, 87% are exempt due to receiving mental health care under section 117 of the Mental Health Act 1983).

The amount a person pays towards their care is decided by the type of care and their personal financial circumstances.

Summary of Impact and Issues

List of proposed changes

1. Improvements to the process for managing people’s disability-related expenses. (This does not apply to those paying the full cost of their care, or people in long-term residential care).
2. Changes to the way we charge for care which is cancelled. In many cases charges will stop. Where charges do not stop, we will explain why.
3. Explaining how charges get going when care starts. If there is a delay in obtaining a person’s financial data, we will explain how long we wait before we start charging the full cost.
4. Changing the method for calculating the cost of non-residential care, from an average rate to the actual cost. (Actual costs are already used for residential care charges).
5. Introducing charges for transport.
6. Increasing the administration charges for processing deferred payment loans. (This affects people paying the full cost of their care only).
7. Changing the “Minimum Income Guarantee” rate used for new customers aged

between 60 and state pension age. This brings us back into line with government guidance.

8. Improvements to the general structure and accessibility of the ASC Charging Policy document. This includes:

- simpler wording
- changing the order of information in the document so that it reflects the order of events for a new customer
- including more diagrams and examples
- including a glossary to explain terms which people might not know
- collecting all the rates and fees we use into one Rates Document.
- explaining how these rates and fees are updated each year.

Impact and issues

Change 1: Overhaul of the process for managing people's disability-related expenses

What is being proposed?

The process for assessing how much a person can afford to pay toward the cost of their care is:

- a) work out the person's income (the Care Act statutory guidance tells us which types of income are included and which are ignored)
- b) subtract an amount that represents what the person needs to live on. This is called the "Minimum Income Guarantee" and is set by the government annually. It varies by age, circumstances and level of need.
- c) the balance is "net disposable income" which we are entitled to ask the person to pay towards the cost of their care.

If a person receives non-residential care, and is in receipt of a disability benefit, they are entitled to ask the council to take into account any extra day-to-day living expenses they incur due to their disability. These are called disability-related expenses, or DREs. Once DREs are approved they reduce the amount a person is charged towards the cost of their care.

We are proposing to change the process for dealing with DRE applications, in a number of ways:

- a) The DREs would be assessed as part of the financial assessment. Currently, they are dealt with after the financial assessment is completed. This means that people's charges would take account of DREs from the outset. The online financial assessment would be amended to allow DREs to be recorded alongside other financial data. The indicative charges provided by that online system would be subject to a review of the DREs being claimed. Appeals against DRE decisions would follow the same process as appeals against financial assessment outcomes.

- b) The proposed policy and rates document explain more about the reasonable checks we would apply to DRE requests. This is done in the interests of transparency and to reduce the number of unrealistic requests we receive.
- c) The list of expenses considered in the draft policy has been shortened to remove those which are rarely used. However, there is always an “other” option for individual cases.
- d) The list of expenses in the draft policy has been enhanced to show which costs we typically accept, which costs are excluded and what evidence we need.
- e) We are proposing to use standard rates for DREs where possible. This ensures consistency and speeds up the decision-making process. To establish typical expenses for heating, food, laundry etc, we will use external sources including:
 - the Office for National Statistics
 - NAFAO (the National Association of Financial Assessment Officers). Annually updated NAFAO guidance is used by many councils to set the standard for DRE rates. This helps us to assess how much of a person’s expenses are above the typical level. NAFAO also recommend standard rates, for example the cost of purchasing and maintaining different types of specialist equipment.
- f) The draft policy explains on what basis the rates will change annually.

What would be the impact?

This change would apply to anyone who is paying a contribution towards the cost of their care, and is receiving care at home, or short stays in a care home.

On 4th May 2023, 378 people were claiming DREs. This is around 23% of our non-residential care customers. However, we know that 70% of non-residential customers are claiming a disability benefit. This suggests that the option to reduce charges by claiming DREs is under-used.

We hope that the overhaul of the DRE process will have a positive impact by:

- a) raising awareness of DREs. We want to ensure that everyone who might be eligible for DREs knows how to make a claim. This may help people who are adversely impacted by other changes being proposed in the new policy
- b) making it clear which kinds of expense are eligible, and how much we consider is reasonable. Customers can then assess for themselves what DREs they are likely to be granted
- c) demonstrating that all customers are treated fairly and consistently
- d) ensuring that DREs are built-in to the person’s charges from the outset, instead of charging them a higher amount and having to adjust this down after the DRE application is processed.

- e) allowing customers to see (via the online financial assessment) their likely charge, including their DREs, at a much earlier stage of the process.
- f) maintaining a route for individual cases to be considered outside of the stated rates and guidelines
- g) merging the DRE appeal process with the financial assessment appeal process so that all concerns can be addressed together.

Staff guidelines relating to DREs would also be overhauled to ensure that customers receive consistent and correct advice about DREs.

Change 2: Changing the way we charge for care which is cancelled

What is being proposed?

We only charge for cancelled care if we incur costs. Recent changes in our provider terms and conditions allow us to simplify the way this is explained in the policy, and provide clearer examples of when someone is likely to be charged. Key points are:

- a) We propose not to charge for care which is cancelled because people are unexpectedly admitted to hospital, if the care is:
 - home care
 - day care
 - supported living
 - miscellaneous services (for example, transport)

This is a change from the existing policy when people could be charged for up to 7 days.

- b) People who cancel their home care, day care or miscellaneous services for reasons other than an unexpected hospital stay, without giving 24 hours' notice to the provider, may still be charged for one day. This will only apply if we have to pay for the cost of staff who could not be re-allocated.
- c) People who are away from care settings which the council continues to pay for during their absence, would still be charged for their care. This is usually because we need to keep their facilities open, for example placements in care homes, residential educational placements and Shared Lives.

What would be the impact?

This proposed change affects all customers but is most relevant to people receiving home care. This is because home care visits are most likely to be extended, cut short or cancelled, and generate a lot of invoicing queries.

During October, November and December 2022, 106 people had 1381 home care visits cancelled due to short spells in hospital of up to a week. These visits were charged for in many cases. In future, we propose that they will not be.

We expect the impact to be positive because:

- a) Anyone being admitted unexpectedly to hospital could have peace of mind that they will not be charged for any non-residential care which they are missing.
- b) Non-residential customers would now understand that they need to give their provider 24 hours' notice, to avoid being charged when they cancel their own care.

Change 3: Clarifying the timing of charges when care first starts

What is being proposed?

In cases where council-arranged care is required, we aim to get the care in place as soon as possible. However, the financial assessment (which works out how much the person can afford to pay for their care) can take longer. It may be a few weeks after care started, before we establish how much the person will be charged.

For residential care, we can charge a temporary, minimum amount while the financial assessment is taking place. However, this is not possible for non-residential care.

The main reason for delays in the financial assessment process is that people fail to provide the data we need. Work is underway to improve the support provided to help people understand what is needed and engage with the process. However, if no data is provided, we eventually have to start charging the full cost of the care.

We are proposing changes to the policy to make it simpler and clearer how this works. The key points are:

- a) If the financial assessment data is provided within 8 weeks of the council requesting it, we would complete the financial assessment. We would then issue charges dating back to the start date of the care.
- b) If 8 weeks have passed since the financial assessment data was requested, and we have not received the data or heard from the person explaining the delay, we would issue charges at the full cost of the care, dating back to the start date of the care. (Previously we only started charging from a maximum of 8 weeks before the financial assessment data was requested).
- c) After we start charging at full cost, if the person sends in their financial data, we would carry out the financial assessment. If this concludes that the person can only afford to pay a contribution to the full cost, we would adjust the charges already issued, back to the start of care, to reflect the new contribution amount. (This ensures that we do not leave any full-cost charges in place once we have established that the person cannot afford to pay them).

What would be the impact?

We anticipate the impact of this change to be very small. Only a few customers are not financially assessed within 8 weeks of their care starting. This is usually because they have not provided the required information or explained the delay, even after several polite reminders have been issued.

In such cases, those customers would be issued with full cost charges, backdated to the start of their care. Previously charges would have been backdated by at most 8 weeks. However, there will be very few cases where this makes a material difference.

The more positive impact is that if a financial assessment is completed after we start charging at full cost, and shows that the customer cannot afford to pay the full cost, their charges will be corrected right back to the start of care. Previously, they would only have been corrected back by at most 8 weeks, potentially leaving some full cost invoices still to be paid.

How can we mitigate the impact?

We now have an online financial assessment which offers two benefits relating to this policy change:

- (i) Customers could get an indicative amount of their contribution very early on, so they would know what their charges are likely to be while they wait for the financial assessment to be finalised, and can budget accordingly, and
- (ii) Customers could submit their data and documents online which speeds up the financial assessment process considerably.

In addition, we plan to improve the level of support provided to people who seem to be unwilling or unable to take part in the financial assessment process. The FAB team and social workers will work together to provide help, guidance and reassurance, with the aim of reducing the number of people who are charged at full cost “by default” to as close to zero as possible.

Change 4: Changing the method for calculating the cost of non-residential care, from an average rate to the actual cost.

What is being proposed?

We are changing the way we define the cost of non-residential care. Currently, in any given week, the cost of care is calculated as the actual amount of care delivered, multiplied by an average rate.

From April 2024 we propose to use the actual cost, which is the amount we pay the provider (excluding any VAT). This will generally be higher than the current average rate.

The aim of this proposed change is to remove an anomaly, where non-residential customers who can afford to pay the full cost of their care, are having some of their care costs paid for by the council. This frees up funds which can be spent on providing care for

people who cannot afford to pay the full cost of their care.

What would be the impact?

Residential care customers would not be affected, because residential care has been charged using the actual cost for many years.

Most non-residential care customers would not be affected because they are either exempt for charging, or are paying a contribution towards the cost of their care (the maximum amount they can afford, worked out by the financial assessment).

There are two groups of non-residential care customers who would be affected:

Group 1: People who are expected to pay the full cost of their care but have still asked the council to arrange their care. (These people will have assets over £23,250 or have chosen not to have a financial assessment). This is approximately 6% of our non-residential care customers, around 80-100 people.

Group 2: People who are paying the cost of the care because the cost is less than their assessed contribution (the maximum amount they can afford to pay, worked out by the financial assessment). This is approximately 16% of our non-residential care customers, around 220 people.

A detailed analysis has been carried out to assess the impact of this change on these two groups.

The full-cost customers in Group 1 would see an increase in their charges averaging 28%, although the range of increases is wide both in terms of amount and percentage. People in this group can afford to pay the full cost of their care, however due to the average charging method we have used up to now, they have not been charged the true full cost. This proposed change will rectify the situation and free up council funds to spend on care for people who cannot afford to pay for it.

The customers in Group 2 would see an increase in their charges averaging 19%. These people are being charged less than the maximum they can afford, and in most cases even after the charges are increased, they would still be charged less than the maximum they can afford. The worst case, for about 30 people, is that the cost of their care would now exceed their assessed contribution amount (from the financial assessment), so they would be charged their contribution from now on.

Both groups would, going forwards, be affected by any change in the rates we pay providers.

How can the impact be mitigated?

We recognise that a sudden increase in charges (even within the range of what people can in theory afford to pay) may cause difficulty for some people. There are several ways the impact could be managed:

- a) Between now and 1st April 2024 we would review the care provisions for the

full-cost customers with the highest charges and the biggest increase in charges. We would check that the provision is proportionate and not more than they need. We would also encourage them to complete a financial assessment if there is any possibility that this will reduce their charges.

- b) Customers could ask to be moved to a cheaper provider if they wish
- c) Full cost customers could decide to arrange their own care if they wish
- d) Customers paying the cost of their care because it is less than their maximum contribution, could ask for a direct payment instead and arrange their own care
- e) Temporary payment plans could be considered, to help people smooth out the impact of a large increase in their charges.
- f) In exceptional cases the council could agree to waive the whole cost of care if necessary

The impact of exposing non-residential customers to changes in our provider payment rates, would be eased by explaining how we manage provider rates, and annual increases, in the policy. In the case of home care, providers can only increase their rates annually, but can (and do) reduce their rates mid-year to be more competitive.

Change 5: Introducing charges for transport.

What is being proposed?

Up to now, any transport services listed on people's support plans which have been arranged by the council, have been provided free of charge. We now propose to charge for transport at the actual cost. This would bring us into line with most other councils, where charging for transport is the norm. The most common use of transport is to take people to and from day care.

By asking people who can afford it, to pay for their transport, we would have more funds for other care to be provided to people who cannot afford to pay for it.

It should be noted that we are one of the very few councils who do not currently charge for transport.

What would be the impact?

People who only pay a contribution towards the cost of their care, or are exempt from charging, would not be affected by this change.

The people who would be affected, are in the same two groups as in change 4 above:

Group 1: People who are expected to pay the full cost of their care but have still asked the council to arrange their care. (These people will have assets over £23,250 or have chosen

not to have a financial assessment). This is approximately 6% of our non-residential care customers, around 80-100 people.

Group 2: People who are paying the cost of the care because the cost is less than their assessed contribution (the maximum amount they can afford to pay, worked out by the financial assessment). This is approximately 16% of our non-residential care customers, around 220 people.

The number of existing customers in these two groups is very small – less than 10 people. The main purpose of the proposed change is to ensure that we charge transport to new customers, so long as the total cost of their care is still within the range of what they can afford (according to the financial assessment).

How can we mitigate the impact?

Firstly, the support planning approach is being reviewed to ensure that we are consistent in the way we define the need for council-arranged transport. Many customers have other options.

Secondly, the way we commission transport services is also under review, to ensure that we can obtain services at a competitive rate.

Finally, customers may choose to make use of friends / family / free community transport options to avoid having to pay these charges.

Change 6: Increasing the administration charges for processing deferred payment loans

What is being proposed?

Deferred payment loans are an option for people who need to move into a care home permanently, and have assets over £23,250 which are all tied up in a property which they do not want to sell. They can apply for a deferred payment loan, and if approved, they will need to complete a deferred payment agreement. The council will pay for their care, having obtained a “first legal charge” on the property so that the council can recover the loan amount when the property is eventually sold.

Interest is charged at a small rate set by the government, and the Care Act 2014 permits the council to charge the customer for the administration costs of operating the loan.

We are proposing to increase the existing setup fee, introduce an annual fee and add other fees which will apply only when specific circumstances arise. In all cases these fees are simply covering our costs, and in all cases, they can be added to the loan if required.

We have taken note of other councils’ fees to ensure that our proposed fees are within a normal range and not excessive.

Specific changes being proposed are:

- a) The one-off setup fee of £730 is increased to £990. (This reflects a more systematic analysis of the workload and increases in staff hourly rates since

2019). An extra fee of £50 would be added if a discretionary meeting is required to discuss an applicant who does not meet the mandatory criteria (for example, if they already have a charge on the property).

- b) A new annual administration fee of £200, to cover the cost of regular maintenance work including producing statements.
- c) An extra fee of £200 for re-valuing the property when the loan amount reaches 80% of the original equity.
- d) Other variable legal fees charged as incurred, in rare cases
- e) All fixed fees will be listed in the rates document which accompanies the charging policy, and increased annually in line with latest costs
- f) Final invoice to attract interest of 4% over the base rate if not paid within 6 months of being issued

What would be the impact?

People affected by this change would be the very small number of full-cost, residential customers who choose to enter a deferred payment agreement in the future. (Existing deferred payment customers would not be affected).

Typically, we have less than 10 new people per year who would experience the new, higher set up fee as well as the annual fees in due course.

Currently, the average weekly cost of care for the existing deferred payment customers is £1008.37. Therefore, the new fees are small values compared with the annual cost of care.

In addition, customers have the option to defer payment of the fees by adding them to the loan.

Change 7: Changing the rate used for the “Minimum Income Guarantee” for new customers aged between 60 and state pension age.

What is being proposed?

When the financial assessment is carried out to assess how much someone can afford to pay for their non-residential care, a key element is the Minimum Income Guarantee, or MIG. This is the amount of a person’s weekly income, which they need to keep for day-to-day living costs. It is set annually by the government, and takes into account the person’s age and level of disability (based on the kind of benefits they are claiming).

The most generous MIG rate is reserved for people of state pension age and over. However, for many years the council has been using this rate for any customers aged 60 or over.

We propose that from April 24, any new customers, and any existing customers aged 59 and under, would not be allocated the highest MIG rate until they reach state pension

age, which will be at the age of 66 or 67. Instead they would be allocated the lower MIG rate for people aged 25+.

What would be the impact?

Existing customers aged 60+ would not be impacted – we would continue to use the higher rate MIG they have already been allocated.

New customers aged 60-66 (there were 32 of these in 2022-23), and existing customers who turn 60 (there were 19 in 2022/23), would simply wait longer than they would have done, before they are allocated the higher MIG rate. This means their charges would be higher than they would have been without the proposed change, but would still be affordable, according to the government-set MIG rates.

No individual person would see any reduction in their MIG rate or increase in charges because of this change.

The increased income raised by this change would help fund other care packages.

Change 8: Improvements to the general structure and accessibility of the ASC Charging Policy document

What is being proposed?

The charging policy is based on the Care Act 2014 regulations and statutory guidance, which means it can be challenging to read and understand.

The Council has suggested edits to the document, to make it more accessible, by:

- a) simplifying the wording
- b) changing the order of information in the document so that it reflects the order of events for a new customer
- c) including more diagrams and examples
- d) including a glossary to explain terms which some people might not know
- e) collecting all the rates and fees we use into one Rates Document
- f) explaining how these rates and fees are updated each year

What would be the impact?

All adult social care customers would be affected by the proposed changes. This includes people whose care is arranged by the council, people receiving a direct payment, and carers.

The intention is that by making the policy easier to read, customers have a better understanding of how we work out what they can afford to pay, and how we calculate the

amount on their invoices.

We would also produce an Easy-Read version of this description of the changes, to ensure that people with Learning Disabilities are not excluded from understanding how charging works.

Potential Positive Impacts

The new ASC Charging Policy should be easier for both customers and staff to understand.

The focus on disability-related expenses (change 1) should raise awareness of this option, for people who feel their charges are excessive or who have challenges with the cost of maintaining their independence, due to a disability.

Most ASC home care customers will see less charges when care is cancelled, particularly when the cause is an unexpected admission to hospital (See change 2).

The council will recover more of its care costs, from people who can afford to pay more (according to the government formula which assesses how much people can afford). This increases the funding available for other customers' care.

Responsible Service Manager	Paula Johnston, Head of Quality, Governance and Professional Development
Date	23-Aug-23
Approved by Senior Manager	
Date	

Potential Impact

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Age	<p>In the Southampton population, the age range of adults is:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">82% aged 18-64 18% aged 65 and over</p> <p>However, for adult social care customers:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">44% aged 18-64 56% aged 65 and over</p> <p>Older people are therefore a very significant cohort to be considered.</p>	

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	<p>While the age profile for non-residential care customers is very similar to this, residential care customers are mainly older (75% are aged 65 and over), while direct payment customers are mainly younger (75% are aged 18-64).</p> <p>The following age-related impacts have been considered, in relation to the proposed changes:</p> <p>Firstly, older people are more likely to be retired and unable to top up their incomes by going out to work. Therefore, any increase in charges can have a significant impact. However, this is compensated for by the fact that government allowances for living costs increase with age, with the highest Minimum Income Guarantee rate for non-residential care being £214.35 per week in 2023-24.</p> <p>Secondly, a proportion of older people may be unable to access the new charging policy and the consultation questionnaire, online.</p> <p>Thirdly, change 7 directly impacts new customers aged 60 to pension age. Their charges will be based on the use of the minimum income guarantee amount for adults below state pension age rather than the more generous MIG rate for people of state pension age, which up to now we have given to anyone over 60. Because this change will not be applied to existing customers, no-one will see an actual increase in charges.</p>	<p>Hard copies of the policy and the questionnaire will be available on request, and the initial letters sent to customers (in the post) will include a phone number and email address to use, for requesting hard copies.</p> <p>Customers who find their charges unaffordable can consider claiming disability-related expenses (DREs), or appealing the outcome of their financial assessment.</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<p>Disability</p>	<p>60.4% of adult social care customers are claiming a disability benefit (disability living allowance, attendance allowance or personal independence payments).</p> <p>Breaking this down by care type, this figure is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 95% for direct payment customers 70% for non-residential customers 37% for short term/respice residential care customers 27% for long-term residential care customers <p>The overhaul of the process for disability-related benefits (change 1) is therefore relevant to most of our customers and the general impacts have been covered above.</p> <p>Disabled people are most likely to require council-arranged transport and will therefore be affected by plans to start charging the cost of transport (see change 5). However, disabled customers who are only paying a contribution towards the cost of their care, will not be affected by this.</p>	<p>Many disabled customers claim a mobility component to their disability benefit which is intended to be used to help with the additional cost of transport.</p> <p>In addition, free and low-cost community transport services are available.</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Gender Reassignment	None of the changes proposed should have any impact on a person because of their gender reassignment status.	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<p>When people are financially assessed, this is done by considering their personal financial circumstances in their own right. The only difference for people in a marriage or civil partnership is that:</p> <p>A) We assume each person gets a 50% share of any jointly assessed, means-tested benefit, for example Pension Credit.</p> <p>b) the partner has the option to share their financial details so that we can ensure they are not disadvantaged by the charges we expect the person to pay.</p> <p>When considering whether to take property into account during the financial assessment for someone moving into a care home permanently, the needs of any partner to have somewhere to live are considered.</p> <p>Beyond these points (which are not being changed), none of the changes proposed should have any impact on a person because of their marital status.</p>	
Pregnancy and Maternity	None of the changes proposed should have any impact on a person because of their pregnancy/maternity status.	
Race	<p>In the Southampton population, the ethnicity profile is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11% Asian/Asian British • 3% Black / Black British 	

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3% Mixed • 81% White/White British • 2% Other <p>The profile for adult social care customers is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4% Asian/British Asian • 2% Black / Black British • 2% Mixed • 89% White/White British • 3% Other/unknown <p>This suggests that some ethnicities are under-represented in the Adult Social Care customer base. The new Adult Social Care Strategy is seeking to address this by ensuring that we make our services accessible to all residents.</p> <p>None of the changes proposed should have any impact on a person because of their ethnicity.</p>	
Religion or Belief	<p>The breakdown of religion shows that of our 2,654 customers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 39% are Christian • 1% are Muslim • 1% are Sikh • 1% are Hindu • 3% state another religion • <1% are atheist • <1% are agnostic • 12% state “no religion” • 3.5% refused or could not say • 39% are unknown <p>None of the changes proposed should have any impact on a person because of their religion.</p>	
Sex	<p>In the Southampton population, 49% are female and 51% male.</p>	

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	<p>Of our adult social care customers, 54% are female and 46% are male.</p> <p>The profile of direct payment and non-residential care customers is the same. However, people receiving short-term/respite residential are 59% female, 41% male. People in long-term residential care are 56% female, 44% male.</p> <p>None of the proposed changes should impact either sex more than the other.</p>	
Sexual Orientation	None of the changes proposed should have any impact on a person because of their sexual orientation.	
Community Safety	n/a	
Poverty	<p>The relative poverty of our customers has been assessed using the ONS Combined Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019.</p> <p>The index indicates the level of deprivation in the local area someone lives in, based on multiple factors including income.</p> <p>This is the deprivation profile for Southampton residents overall – figures show the percentage of people living in the most deprived areas, then the slightly less deprived areas etc:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top 20% most deprived: 28% • Next 20%: 35% • Next 20%: 19% • Next 20%: 14% • 20% least deprived: 4% 	

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	<p>The profile for adult social care customers is similar overall, except for people in residential care. This group has much lower numbers in the most deprived areas and more people in the least deprived areas.</p> <p>Another ONS measure, the Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI) was also checked. The results for the Southampton population were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top 20% most deprived: 26% • Next 20%: 30% • Next 20%: 20% • Next 20%: 18% • 20% least deprived: 6% <p>Again, the pattern for our customers was similar, with the same exception for people in care homes.</p> <p>This difference between the IMD and IDAOPI profiles suggests that older people are overall slightly less deprived than the population as a whole.</p> <p>The amount we charge for care has a significant effect on people with low incomes. However, all the changes being proposed have been carefully considered to ensure that no one is required to pay more than they can afford. The government-set minimum income guarantee (for people living at home) and personal expenses allowance (for people in care homes) ensure that people are left with sufficient income to cover their reasonable day-to-day living costs.</p>	<p>Customers who consider that they are being charged more than they can afford, can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claim disability-related expenses, to reduce their charges • Request an updated financial assessment, if their income/ assets/ expenses have changed • Appeal the outcome of their financial assessment • Request that charges are waived, in exceptional circumstances

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<p>Health & Wellbeing</p>	<p>Ensuring customers’ health and wellbeing is at the core of adult social care practice.</p> <p>Change 1 (Improving information on disability-related expenses, and ensuring we apply these fairly) will support health and wellbeing.</p> <p>None of the proposed changes should impact adversely on anyone’s health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Customers who lack mental capacity to manage their financial affairs, which includes many of our Appointeeship customers, may require an Advocate to speak on their behalf during the consultation. An Advocacy service is available on request.</p>	<p>If discussion of charges and increases in charges causes anxiety, customers are urged to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talking to their social worker • Seeking independent financial advice • Consulting useful web sites including those listed below. <p>Age UK website: Money and legal advice for seniors Age UK</p> <p>Independent Age</p> <p>Money Helper</p> <p>Society of Later Life Advisers - SOLLA</p> <p>Financing Later Life Care - Which?</p> <p>Getting financial advice - Citizens Advice</p>
<p>Care-Experienced</p>	<p>None of the proposed changes will target people with care experience, however we recognise that people in this group are more likely to be vulnerable and on a low income.</p> <p>During financial assessments, we already allocate 18–25-year-olds the more generous 25+ rate for the minimum income guarantee (leaving them with more income to spend on day-to-day living costs), and will continue to do so.</p>	
<p>Other Significant Impacts</p>	<p>No other significant impacts have been identified at this time following the consultation feedback.</p>	



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 proposals and consider mitigating action.

Name or Brief Description of Proposal	School Travel Service and Post-16 Travel Service Policy 2024-25
Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)	
<p>Under the 1996 Education Act, Southampton City Council has a statutory duty to provide free of charge travel arrangements to facilitate the attendance at school of eligible children within the Council’s administrative boundary. The Education Act 1996 requires that transport support is provided to children of compulsory school age who attend their nearest suitable school and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • live more than the statutory walking distance from that school, or • could not reasonably be expected to walk to that school because of their special educational needs, disability or mobility problem, even if they were accompanied by their parent, or • would not be able to walk to that school in reasonable safety, even if they were accompanied by their parent, or • meet the ‘extended rights’ criteria for children from low-income households. <p>The policy also includes a statement specifying the arrangements for the provision of travel or other support to facilitate the attendance of all persons of sixth form age and adult learners (over the age of 19 and under the age of 25) receiving education or training (including those with and Education, Health and Care plan). There is no legal requirement to provide travel assistance to Early Years children, post-16 students or adult learners. However, local authorities must adhere to the statutory guidance on post-16 transport and the</p>	

Equalities Act 2010 when developing school travel policy and publishing school travel policy statements for Early Years children, post-16 and adult learners.

This policy sets out Southampton City Council's approach to the operation of the School Travel Service in Southampton. It sets out the Council's statutory requirements along with local policy, including the criteria for eligibility, the type of travel support the council may provide and how to appeal a decision. The legal responsibility for ensuring a child's attendance at school rests with the child's parent or carer. Parents and carers are generally expected to provide travel arrangements for their child to travel to and from school.

This policy applies to children and young people whose permanent home address is within the administrative boundaries of Southampton City Council. Children and young people studying in, but not resident in, Southampton should refer to the relevant transport policies issued by the local authority in their resident area.

There are currently approximately 300 mainstream children utilising the School Travel Service and 1,250 SEND children.

Summary of Impact and Issues

The School Travel Service and Post-16 Travel Service Policy 2024-25 updates the previous policy and provides a clearer document that will enable service users to better understand the Council's travel service offer and any support that they may be entitled to.

To achieve this, the following changes are proposed:

- Wording amended to ensure terminology is consistent and more accurately reflects the service offer. This is in line with the service's rebrand from 'Home to School Travel' to 'School Travel Service'.
- Addition of a clear hierarchy of travel support options.
- Additional information on the appeals process.
- Requirement for parents who wish to apply for travel support to list their nearest suitable school on their school application form.

Potential Positive Impacts

The policy has been drafted to be fair and transparent. The wording of the policy has been reviewed to clarify the travel service offer and ensure terminology used in the policy is consistent and in line with the way the service operates. This means the policy is now an accurate reflection of the service offer.

Additional detail has been added to the appeals process, to make it clear what the appellant can expect when making an appeal.

A clear 'hierarchy' of travel assistance options has been set out to clearly indicate to parents/carers the order in which different forms of travel support will be considered, to increase transparency about the operation of the School Travel Service.

Responsible Service Manager	Marianne Alford, Transport Services Manager
Date	19/09/2023
Approved by Senior Manager	Annamarie Hooper, Service Manager – Service Delivery and Compliance
Date	25/09/2023

Potential Impact

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Age	This School Travel Service policy impacts children of compulsory school age, post-16 students and adult learners (up to age 25 where they are continuing on a course started before their 19th birthday). Travel support will be provided in line with statutory duties.	N/A – no change to policy or provision
Disability	Southampton City Council will provide travel support for all children of compulsory school age who cannot be expected to walk to school or travel independently by reason of their Special Educational Need and/or Disability (SEND), to the nearest most appropriate school based on their needs, in line with the council's statutory duties. Travel support for post-16 students and adult learners (up to age 25 where they are continuing on a course started before their 19th birthday) with Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities will be provided based on assessed need. Students and/or their parents/carers will not be required to contribute towards	N/A – no change to policy or provision

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	<p>the cost of this service.</p> <p>Where a child lives within walking distance of the nearest qualifying school (or designated school if it is not the nearest) but the route to school relies on parent/carer with a disability accompanying that child for it to be considered safe, and the parent/carer's disability prevents them from doing so, the child will be eligible for school travel free of charge. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis, with medical evidence of the parent's disability requiring confirmation.</p>	
Gender Reassignment	No identified impact.	N/A
Care experienced	No identified impact.	N/A
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No identified impact.	N/A
Pregnancy and Maternity	Where pregnancy or maternity impacts a parent/carer's ability to support their child's travel to and from school, they may be eligible for travel assistance under the Exceptional Circumstances Criteria.	N/A – no change to policy or provision
Race	No identified impact.	N/A
Religion or Belief	Children will be eligible for free school travel under 'extended rights' where the pupil is entitled to free school meals the school is between 2 and 15 miles and is the nearest school preferred on the grounds of religion or belief (aged 11-16).	N/A – no change to policy or provision

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Sex	No identified impact.	N/A
Sexual Orientation	No identified impact.	N/A
Community Safety	No identified impact.	N/A
Poverty	No identified impact.	N/A
Health & Wellbeing	No identified impact.	N/A
Other Significant Impacts	No identified impacts.	N/A

DRAFT

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 proposals and consider mitigating action.

Name or Brief Description of Proposal	Increase council tax premium for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • second home owners and • empty homes after one year
Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)	
<p>The proposals are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introduce a council tax premium of 100% on second homes (subject to legislation being approved) • introduce a council tax premium of 100% where a property has been empty for more than 12 months (subject to legislation being approved) <p>As of 27 September 2023, there are 906 properties currently registered as being unoccupied and furnished, and therefore potentially second homes. Most are within council tax bands A to C.</p> <p>This means doubling the council tax that they will have to pay. As of 27 September 2023, there are currently 278 properties that have been empty for between 12 months and 24 months. Most are within council tax bands A to C</p>	
Summary of Impact and Issues	
<p>The proposals are to-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Introduce a council tax premium of 100% for people with second homes This means doubling the council tax that they will have to pay. b) Introduce a council tax premium of 100% for people with properties that have remained empty for 12 months or more This will change the current policy of charging a 100% premium where a property is empty and unfurnished for a period from 2 years 	

Appendix 1 Draft ESIA

The proposals to introduce the two council tax premiums above are linked to the Levelling up and Regeneration Bill which is currently going through Parliament. So they can only be implemented once this Bill becomes law. They are supported by the Local Government Association

[Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill, Second Reading, House of Lords, 17 January 2023 | Local Government Association](#)

The changes to policy will apply to all taxpayers who have dwellings which meet the criteria irrespective of whether they have any protected characteristics or not.

Potential Positive Impacts

The proposals will generate additional Council Tax revenue for precepting bodies; facilitating the delivery of essential front-line services.

The key rationale for the recommendations is to:

- Incentivise the occupation of empty properties
- Discourage, or generate additional income from, second home ownership in order to ensure the supply of homes to meet local housing needs

Responsible Service Manager	Andrew Armour, Revenues and Benefits Service Manager
------------------------------------	--

Date	
-------------	--

Approved by Senior Manager	Vanessa Shahani, Head, Income and Expenditure
-----------------------------------	---

Date	
-------------	--

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Age	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.
Disability	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently

Appendix 1 Draft ESIA

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
		<p>been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.</p>
Gender Reassignment	<p>There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.</p>	<p>There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.</p>
Care Experienced	<p>There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.</p>	<p>There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<p>There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.</p>	<p>There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when</p>

Appendix 1 Draft ESIA

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
		making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.
Pregnancy and Maternity	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.
Race	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.
Religion or Belief	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.
Sex	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group

Appendix 1 Draft ESIA

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	identified as a result of these proposals.	as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.
Sexual Orientation	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified as a result of these proposals.	There are no specific benefits or disadvantages that have been identified for this group as a result of these proposals. As the impact has currently been identified as neutral, no mitigating actions are suggested. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.
Community Safety	None identified at this time. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.	
Poverty	None identified at this time. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.	Consultation might highlight other impacts and solutions and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.
Health & Wellbeing	None identified at this time. This could change as a result of consultation and, if this is the case, will be taken into account when making the final decision about any changes to the current scheme.	

Appendix 1 Draft ESIA

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<p>Other Significant Impacts</p>	<p>Increasing housing supply locally and bringing properties back into the currently short supply of local private rental sector has the potential to benefit a broad spectrum of groups who have protected characteristics.</p> <p>The proposals to introduce the council tax premiums for second homes and properties that have been empty for 12 months or more, could incentivise homeowners to release their properties onto the market, for either sale or rent. If offered for rent, this could help ease local housing pressures. The majority of the properties are in the lower council tax bands (A to C) so could help ease pressures in the private rented sector</p>	

DRAFT



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 proposals and consider mitigating action.

Name or Brief Description of Proposal	Consideration for the future of Holcroft House
Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)	
<p>Holcroft House is a 34 bedroom residential home providing short and long term care for adults living with dementia. There are currently 14 long term residents and 4 temporary residents. There are 52 members of staff currently working at Holcroft House (This is not FTE equivalent).</p> <p>A Fire Safety Assessment (FSA) has identified a number of issues that will need addressing at Holcroft House whereby residents will need to relocate during the works over a period of 18 months. Funds were initially identified for the initial work but costs have since increased exponentially and additional work identified in relation to asbestos bringing the current estimations to over £1m, with potential for that to increase.</p> <p>The Fire Service are aware there is a pending decision on the future of the building and have agreed the building is safe in the short term but will need addressing if the building is to stay open.</p> <p>There are currently a number of homes that are CQC registered with dementia care within the city which have a number of vacancies as of May 2023.</p>	

Planning for the proposed home closure will take into account the assessed needs of every individual resident of the home and how these can best be met in the future. The assessments will be conducted in partnership with other professionals and agencies to minimise impact, particularly with regards to their health and well-being. The review process will identify suitable placements to meet the needs of the resident, and this will be equal to the standard of Holcroft House.

The proposed closure will be carefully managed and will include an individual transition plan for all residents. Care staff will be supported throughout to ensure a safe and excellent quality of care is provided throughout the closure process.

Summary of Impact and Issues

Due to the fire safety and subsequent asbestos works that would be required at Holcroft House (over 18 months) there would be a need to relocate residents multiple times. By relocating the residents once, this will reduce the impact of additional moves which can be detrimental to their health.

The proposal is therefore, to close Holcroft House and support residents in relocating to alternative accommodation.

Each resident's care and support needs and financial assessment will be reviewed on an individual basis.

The proposed closure of the current provision has the potential to affect services provided to adults with care and support needs including:

- Adults with dementia
- Adults with physical disabilities
- Adults with sensory support needs
- Short term provision
- Families and representatives

Potential impacts identified so far include:

- Some residents that are currently in Holcroft House may find it upsetting to move as they may have been living in the area and home for a while. A full assessment will be carried out for each resident before they move. These assessments will be based on good practice guidelines on closing residential homes and settling people into new accommodation. Residents, families and representatives will also have access to independent advocacy support.

- The proposed closure, will require the council to support existing residents to move to alternative placements. Whilst we will work sensitively to minimise the impact their vulnerability may mean they find it a challenging experience. It will mean a change of environment and staff team and it will take time to manage the transition.
- Residents' concerns and levels of anxiety could impact their emotional and physical wellbeing particularly just before a move or immediately afterwards. Relatives of residents may also have concerns relating to finding suitable alternate care and support which could impact their health and wellbeing.

Residents, families and representatives will be involved in on-going discussions, assessment processes and planning for the future.

Although there is a presumption that all individuals have mental capacity, until there is evidence to the contrary it is likely that some of the residents may lack the capacity to make decisions or complex decisions about their residence and their care and support. If after the mental capacity assessment there is evidence that the individual lacks capacity to make decisions relating to their care and support needs, the council will need to arrange a best interest decision meeting. In some cases an application to the Court of Protection may be required.

Each individuals' rights under relevant legislation including the Care Act 2014, and Mental Capacity Act 2005, would be ensured and best practice and Care Quality Commission Managing Care Home Closures Guidance (2016) will be followed.

Potential Positive Impacts

Residents will be relocated once to an alternative provision rather than multiple time during building works.

By relocating the residents once, this will reduce the impact of additional moves which can be detrimental to their health.

Assurances will be made to provide an improved or at least equivalent level of care through existing commissioning arrangements with other providers for our impacted residents. The process will ensure full consultation with families, residents and advocates where necessary. The review process will identify suitable placements to meet the needs of the resident. We will also ensure friendship groups are maintained as far as possible. Planning for the home closure will take into account the assessed needs of every individual resident of the home and how these can best be met in the future.

Each individuals' rights under the Care Act and Mental Capacity Act would be ensured.	
Responsible Service Manager	
Date	
Approved by Senior Manager	
Date	

Potential Impact

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Age	<p>The greatest impact is likely to be on those older service users who have been using Holcroft for many years and for whom any change in provision will be difficult.</p> <p>All of the residents are over 65 years.</p> <p>Families/residents will be supported to review alternative placements and to under their particular needs, circumstances and preferences.</p> <p>There is potential for decline in residents' emotional and physical health during and immediately after any move following closure of a care home.</p>	<p>Needs assessments and reviews will take place for all residents prior to any changes. Through this process information on alternatives will be made available. Where changes need to be made, a gradual approach will be taken to support those who will be most affected. Advocacy services are in place to help support the individual and ensure that the move is in their best interest.</p> <p>Individual transition plans will be produced and updated. Where necessary other professionals and agencies will be called upon to support the individual to minimise any impact.</p> <p>There is adequate residential and non-residential provision in or</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
		near the boundary of the city.
Disability	<p>All residents have a cognitive impairment and a number also have a physical impairment.</p> <p>The proposal may have either a positive or negative impact depending on the individual and the extent to which they prefer current models of service.</p> <p>Those with physical disabilities may experience a larger impact due to some of the alternative options not having the equipment to be able to support appropriately and being able to accommodate in private sector, however, this will be no different to our internal homes.</p>	<p>As above, any proposed move will be considered carefully taking into account the persons best interest's and their and their and families' wishes and feelings. Any move will ensure that the individual's assessed eligible needs for care and support are met, including ensuring they have appropriate equipment.</p> <p>A project management team will be set up who will prepare a Closure Plan which will be reviewed regularly and will be followed.</p> <p>There is adequate residential provision in or near the boundary of the city.</p> <p>Residents and their carers will be supported to identify the most appropriate alternative option which meets their physical needs.</p>
Gender Reassignment	No identified impact.	Any potential risks can be mitigated by support to access alternative, appropriate services such as peer support and by working with other agencies to ensure all purchased and community services are accessible to all communities.

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No identified impact.	No married or civil partnership couples within our home currently, however, if this changed then they would be accommodated together.
Pregnancy and Maternity	No identified impact.	
Race	<p>Residents and families will be able to choose, to some extent, from a range of alternative provision and arrange services that are culturally appropriate.</p> <p>Currently there are no residents at Holcroft requiring additional support or consideration in relation to culture or race.</p>	All residents will have an assessment prior to any change which will include cultural issues.
Religion or Belief	<p>Residents and families will be able to choose, to some extent, from a range of alternative provision and arrange services that are appropriate to their individual need including religion and belief.</p> <p>Currently there are no residents at Holcroft who have identified support or consideration in relation to religion or beliefs, however services are held in-house on a regular basis and residents are encouraged to attend should they wish to.</p>	All residents will have an assessment prior to any service change which will address matters of religion and belief and where appropriate, plans put in place to support within identified alternative accommodation
Sex	<p>Residents and families will be able to choose, to some extent, from a range of alternative provision and arrange services that are tailored to their needs including single gender services.</p> <p>Currently there are a higher percentage of women living at Holcroft than men. There are no issues or concerns identified</p>	All residents will have an assessment prior to any service change which will address matters relating to sex, should this be required.

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	that may impact upon residents in this area.	
Sexual Orientation	No identified impact	
Community Safety	No identified impact	
Poverty	Risk of additional costs to families or residents through decision to close Holcroft and move to alternative accomodation	<p>Through the assessment process, we will consider the transport costs and any other costs as part of the care and support plan to move.</p> <p>If families are unable to assist or it cannot assist because of the person's needs, the council would look to meet the costs for transitioning across to new provision.</p> <p>Where an individual is self-funding their current placement at Holcroft House, the council will meet statutory duties.</p>
Health & Wellbeing	Residents' concerns and levels of anxiety could impact their emotional and physical wellbeing particularly just before and move or immediately afterwards. Relatives of residents may also have concerns relating to finding suitable alternate care and support which could impact their health and wellbeing.	<p>Needs assessments and reviews will take place for all residents prior to any changes taking place. Through this process information on alternatives will be made available.</p> <p>Individual transition plans will be produced and updated. This plan will include analysing the impact and where necessary other professionals and agencies will be called upon to support the</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
		<p>individual to minimise any impact. Families/residents will be supported to review alternative placements and to under their particular needs, circumstances and preferences.</p>
<p>Other Significant Impacts</p>	<p>Risk of reduced capacity within City for external Southampton residents requiring residential accommodation.</p>	<p>Within Southampton city residential care market, there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the residents.</p> <p>We are not expecting this to negatively impact on the availability for other service groups.</p>



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 proposals and consider mitigating action.

Name or Brief Description of Proposal	Removal of the off-peak classification from the Itchen Bridge toll
Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)	
<p>The Itchen Bridge first opened in 1977 to reduce the congestion from traffic leaving and entering the city. The bridge is operated and maintained by Southampton City Council and uses a variable toll, which is based on the height of the vehicle at the front axle. The Itchen Bridge serves as a major link between the east and west of the city, with a flow of around 18-20,000 vehicles per day. Crossing the bridge has always been subject to a toll payment, upon opening of the bridge with reasons for maintaining the toll outlined in the Hampshire Act 1983.</p> <p>Some regular users of the bridge make payments by using a Smartcities card, whilst other users currently pay by cash, including people passing through the city on business or for leisure, and non-regular users. Concessions are available to local residents and local commercial businesses when paying using a Smartcities card.</p> <p>Residents with a Blue Badge and who receive Smartcities eligible mobility related benefit payments are entitled to free travel across the Itchen Toll Bridge with a Smartcities card.</p> <p>The toll charges were last amended in 2022, with an increase in the peak charges of £0.20 and off peak charges of £0.10. The discount available to Southampton residents via the Smart Card was frozen.</p> <p>Below is a table which shows the current charge for crossing the Itchen Bridge:</p>	

	Non-Smart Card users	Non-resident (Smart Card)	Local Resident (Smart Card)	Local Commercial (Smart Card)	Local Taxi Concession (Smart Card)
Class 1 – motorcycles and three-wheeled vehicles	Free	Free	Free	Free	N/A
Class 2 – cars, small vans and small 4x4s OFF PEAK	80p	80p	30p	30p	N/A
Class 2 – cars, small vans and small 4x4s *PEAK	£1.00	£1.00	40p	40p	N/A
Class 3 large vans (e.g. transit) and large 4x4s	£1.40	N/A	60p	60p	80p
Class 4 HGVs	£25	£25	£2	£2	N/A

*Peak Times are 07:00-09:30 and 16:00 to 18:30

Summary of Impact and Issues

The 1st proposal is to increase remove the off peak classification from the Itchen Bridge vehicles in classes 2 and above crossing the bridge, who are not eligible for a concession. This will impact all users, whether using a smart card or paying in cash, who are driving cars, small vans and small 4x4.

Southampton Residents that receive a concessionary toll through use of a Smart Card will still have access to the discounted toll, but there will no longer be an off peak option. Southampton Residents who do not currently have a Smartcities card would need to apply for one in order to benefit from this discount.

The 2nd proposal is to increase the toll for Class 4 vehicles from £25 to £40 and the associated concession from £2 to £3.

The proposed charges would be as follows:

	Non-Smart Card users	Non-resident (Smart Card)	Local Resident (Smart Card)	Local Commercial (Smart Card)	Local Taxi Concession (Smart Card)
Class 1 – motorcycles and three-wheeled vehicles	Free	Free	Free	Free	N/A
Class 2 – cars, small vans and small 4x4s	£1.00	£1.00	40p	40p	N/A
Class 3 large vans (e.g. transit) and large 4x4s	£1.40	N/A	60p	60p	80p
Class 4 HGVs	£40	£40	£3	£3	N/A

Potential Positive Impacts

Removing the off-peak classification would encourage an increased number of users currently crossing during that time to make a meaningful decision about whether to use that route for the benefit of reduced traffic along Portsmouth Road corridor. The increased Class 4 toll would strongly encourage HGV traffic to use the alternative routes for gaining access to the M27.

Responsible Service Manager	Richard Alderson
Date	09/11/23
Approved by Senior Manager	Pete Boustred
Date	09/11/23

Potential Impact

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Age	Removal of the off-peak period will impact on drivers of all ages	Residents of the city not already doing so can apply for a concession via

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
		a Smart Cities card to benefit from the reduced toll
Disability	No specific impact as increased charges will impact on all drivers. Existing mitigation for drivers with mobility issues is already in place.	People with mobility issues may qualify for the Disabled Concession
Gender Reassignment	No identified impact	N/A
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No identified impact	N/A
Pregnancy and Maternity	No identified impact	N/A
Race	No identified impact	N/A
Religion or Belief	No identified impact	N/A
Sex	No identified impact	N/A
Sexual Orientation	No identified impact	N/A
Community Safety	No identified impact	N/A
Poverty	This proposal may have a negative impact on users who need to travel to across the bridge to work or other reasons	Southampton Residents can access the concessionary toll via the Smart Cities card which still constitutes a significantly reduced rate
Health & Wellbeing	No identified impact	N/A
Other Significant Impacts	None	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 proposals and consider mitigating action.

<p>Name or Brief Description of Proposal</p>	<p>Landlord Controlled Heating:</p> <p>During 2022/23 the Council’s Landlord Controlled Heating Account was impacted by significantly increased energy costs. This resulted in a deficit of £3.6m. Charges were increased from April 2023, which has prevented the deficit from getting any worse, however a recovery plan is required to recover the deficit in a way that minimises impact on tenants. The proposal is to recover over a 5 year period, which will result in a n increase in charge of 6.5% in 2024/25, and an estimated 5% in 2025/6 and 2026/7, which will be subject to review when further energy cost forecasts are received. Taking no action is not sustainable financially.</p> <p>Rental increases:</p> <p>Rent Increase for the 2024/25 financial year. It is necessary to increase rents to ensure a balanced Housing Revenue Account in 2024/25, to be able to continue to maintain homes through repairs and to ensure the capital programme is robust and provide additional capacity to invest to support improving the council’s decent homes programme, and to ensure the long term sustainability of the business plan over the next 40 years. The maximum allowable increase under government legislation is 7.7%.</p> <p>Impacts on the Housing Revenue Account, tenants, and leaseholders.</p>
<p>Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)</p>	

<p>There are approximately 15,277 council tenancies in the city who will be affected by increases in rent.</p> <p>There are 5,486 properties that will be affected by the increase in the landlord heating charge.</p> <p>We have 2010 Leaseholders and 300 of these leaseholders will be affected by the increase in landlord-controlled heating.</p>	
<p>Summary of Impact and Issues</p>	
<p>SCC have 15,277 council tenants with 6,228 receiving Universal Credit and 5,156 receiving Housing Benefit. Housing costs are covered in Universal Credit and Housing Benefit payments so there are 11,384 households that would not be affected by the rent increase.</p> <p>The Housing Revenue Accounts needs income from rents to be able to maintain properties that need repair and to undertake capital projects to improve the homes that our tenants live in.</p>	
<p>Potential Positive Impacts</p>	
<p>Services need to be paid for and service charges recover some of the costs that provide those services enabling the funding that is currently directed towards paying for these services to be directed towards improvements to the services that customers receive, their homes and neighbourhoods.</p>	
Responsible Service Manager	Jamie Brenchley
Date	17.11.2023
Approved by Senior Manager	
Date	17.11.2023

Potential Impact

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Age	<p>Tenants range in ages from 17 through to 100 years of age will all be impacted by the proposals.</p> <p>In relation to increase in rents tenants will have increased costs.</p> <p>In relation to heating charge increase those paying for the service will be impacted by an increase in charge</p>	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs</p> <p>The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs and additional</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
		hardship and winter fuel payments.
Disability	<p>In relation to increase in rents tenants will have increased costs.</p> <p>In relation to heating charge increase those paying for the service will be impacted by an increase in charge in this group as some have a disability or need extra support.</p>	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs and additional hardship and winter fuel payments. Additional support can be given from the Welfare Rights team in Housing for these households in terms of enabling them to access any potential additional support available to them.</p>
Gender Reassignment	No overall impact.	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs and additional hardship and winter fuel payments. Additional support can be given from the Welfare Rights team in Housing for these households in terms of enabling them to</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
		<p>access any potential additional support available to them.</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No overall impact	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs and additional hardship and winter fuel payments. Additional support can be given from the Welfare Rights team in Housing for these households in terms of enabling them to access any potential additional support available to them.</p>
Pregnancy and Maternity	No overall impact.	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs. Additional support can be given from the Welfare Rights team in Housing for these households in terms of enabling them to access any potential</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
		<p>additional support available to them.</p>
Race	No overall impact identified.	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs. Additional support can be given from the Welfare Rights team in Housing for these households in terms of enabling them to access any potential additional support available to them.</p>
Religion or Belief	No overall impact.	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs. Additional support can be given from the Welfare Rights team in Housing for these households in terms of enabling them to access any potential additional support available to them.</p>

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
Sex	No overall impact.	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs. Additional support can be given from the Welfare Rights team in Housing for these households in terms of enabling them to access any potential additional support available to them.</p>
Sexual Orientation	No overall impact.	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs. The Government have provided households in the country with targeted financial help towards their energy costs. Additional support can be given from the Welfare Rights team in Housing for these households in terms of enabling them to access any potential additional support available to them.</p>
Community Safety	No overall impact.	Not applicable.
Poverty	All proposals will have an impact on poverty as there are proposed increases in rents. Tenants and	Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in

Impact Assessment	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
	<p>leaseholders will have increased housing costs.</p> <p>In relation to heating charge increase those paying for the service will be impacted by an increase in charge.</p>	<p>rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>For those on Universal Credit or Housing Benefit there will be the annual increase in benefits for the 2024/25 year which will help alleviate the impact this increase could have as people will receive additional income to help offset the heating charge increase.</p>
Care Experienced	<p>There are 2 care leavers currently who are tenants who will be impacted by the rent increase.</p>	<p>If they are in receipt of benefits they will not be affected by the increase in rent. If they are not in receipt of benefits they can receive the additional support given from the Welfare Rights team within Housing.</p>
Health & Wellbeing	<p>In relation to health and wellbeing there may be an impact on households due to a reduction in income for households from the increase in rent and heating charge costs.</p>	<p>Those on Universal Credit & Housing Benefit will not be affected by the increase in rent as these benefits include rent costs.</p> <p>The Government have provided every household in the country with financial help towards their energy costs.</p>
Other Significant Impacts	None	

This page is intentionally left blank

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique Identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	213	Created Date:	19/06/2023	Last Review Date:	
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Maximise Supporting Families payment by results claim				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Rob Henderson, Executive Director - Children and Learning				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	Children and Learning Service: Further Cost Reduction Proposals				
Project/Programme Manager <i>Name</i>	Stuart Webb, Head of Quality Assurance				
Project/Programme Sponsor <i>Name</i>	Rob Henderson, Executive Director - Children and Learning				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Increase Supporting Families funding by increased PBR claim. Via a benchmarking tool embedded within care director we identified 329 families in 23/23 year for a claim totalling £263,200. Proposal is to increase this to a claim for 533 families which will total £426,400. Increased income of £163,200.				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment: A successful, sustainable organisation		Secondary Alignment: Strong Foundations for life		
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial		Benefit Category: Cost Savings		
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	No	Comments:	NA		
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	None				
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	N/A				
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	Yes/No				
ESIA Guidance and template					
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	Assumption that we will identify and successfully claim for an additional 204 families in the year, totaling 533 families. 329 families claimed in 2023/23				
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	There are risks that there will be insufficient families identified which meet criteria. Currently all families are identified through C&F1st teams. Any reductions to this service will detrimentally impact capacity to meet this target. Given the increased target we will be reliant on identifying some families open to statutory social work teams. If these teams do not use the benchmarking tool embedded within the single assessment we will not ifam (automated software) being implemented and operating optimally. Benchmarking tool embedded within care director being used by statutory case holding teams.				
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>					
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	We will measure via quarterly data returns to DLUC.				
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2023/24				

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Identify and claim for more families using the supporting families funding	Dan Buckle	1st April 2023	31.03.24
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
£263,200 in 22/23	march '22	£426,400	March '24	quarterly	DLUC return

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
81,000	81,000	81,000	81,000	81,000	81,000

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by *Role and Name*

Date

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	527	Created Date:	19/06/2023	Last Review Date:	
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Adjust SGO allowances in line with carers' annual reviews and SCC policy. Net reduction in cost				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Rob Henderson, Executive Director - Children and Learning				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	Children and Learning Service: Further Cost Reduction Proposals				
Project/Programme Manager Name	Stuart Webb, Head of Quality Assurance				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Rob Henderson, Executive Director - Children and Learning				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Payments made for Special Guardianship Payments (SGOs) have not been reviewed in sometime meaning some payments may be incorrect or are being paid when they should have ceased. Financial assessments will be carried out for all SGO carers to ensure that allowances are being paid correctly. This full review is likely to establish incorrect payments, including some that should be reduced or ceased.				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	A successful, sustainable organisation		Secondary Alignment: Strong Foundations for life	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial		Benefit Category: Cost Savings		
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	No	Comments:	NA		
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>					
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	SGO carers will be receiving correct allowances based on an up-to-date assessment of their financial circumstances.				
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	Yes/No				
ESIA Guidance and template					
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	Work needs to be carried out to contact all SGO carers, either by e-mail or letter, to ask them to complete a financial assessment form. It will then take time to work through and respond to queries, complete the financial assessment, give notice to carers of any changes to payments and to follow up carers who have not responded within the deadlines given.				
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	SGO allowances will stay the same for carers who are on a fixed rate. Allowances for those on a variable rate could increase or decrease depending on their current financial circumstances. The financial outcome of the review will not be known until all carers have been assessed.				
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	The realisation of the saving is dependent on carers identified that are either being paid when they should no longer be receiving a payment or they are being paid at a higher rate than they should be based on their financial circumstances now.				
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	The total weekly and annual cost of SGO allowances paid before the review compared to the total weekly and annual cost after the review.				
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2023/24				

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Review by Finance team to ensure payments reflect correct information - then becomes BAU within Children and learning. Review with project plan underway with weekly meetings on progress		1st Sept 2023	31.12.23
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e. FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by *Role and Name*

Date

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	529	Created Date:	Last Review Date:
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Children and Learning rapid service redesign		
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Rob Henderson		
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	Rapid Service Redesign		
Project/Programme Manager Name			
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Rob Henderson		

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	This proposal will implement a service structure which will continue the improvement journey the service are on, while improving outcomes for Children and delivering both financial and non-financial savings.		
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment: A successful, sustainable organisation	Secondary Alignment: Strong Foundations for life	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial	Benefit Category: Cost Savings	
Which of the SCC Cost Drivers does this proposal contribute to?	Primary cost driver: Staffing	Secondary cost driver:	
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	None		
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	Residents - Increase outcomes for children and families within the city, both social care and education performance factors.		
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No	Will be completed in due course	
ESIA Guidance and template			
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>			
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	The timing of any consultation will need to be managed to maximise the financial savings to be achieved. Due to the level of changes proposed there is a risk some staff, and knowledge will depart the organisation. Risk of a destabilised workforce during the change period.		
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Family Safeguarding Model Implementation. Pathfinder project implementation - this is TBC dependant upon bid outcome.		
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>			
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	Financial monthly reporting.		
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2024/25		

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Present proposals to Transformation Board	Rob Henderson	28/11/2023	28/11/2023
2	Consult upon changes with staff	Rob Henderson	31/01/2024	31/03/2024
3	Implement changes	All C&L HoS	01/04/2024	01/06/2024
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
Current Staffing Budget - £TBC	Nov-23	TBC	01/06/2024	Monthly	Monthly financial monitoring

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
£600k	£600k	£600k	£600k	£600k	£600k

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by *Role and Name*
Signed of by Budget Champion *Role and Name*
Signed of by Finance BP *Role and Name*
Date

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	143	Created Date:	01/06/2023	Last Review Date:	
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Extend street lighting switch off from current hours to 00:30 – 05:30				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Paul Paskins				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	n/a				
Project/Programme Manager Name	Paul Paskins				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Mel Creighton				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Cost avoidance attributed towards previous saving for street light switch off.				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	A successful, sustainable organisation		Secondary Alignment:	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial	Benefit Category: Cost Savings			
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	Yes	Comments:			
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	Any service supported				
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	Minimal				
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No				
ESIA Guidance and template					
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>					
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>					
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>					
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>					
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2023/24				

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1				
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e. FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
£124,500	£186,800	£186,800	£186,800	£186,800	£186,800

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by Paul Paskins

Date 07/06/2023

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique Identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	280	Created Date:	Last Review Date:
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Discontinue Insurance cover for Schools IT Equipment		
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Steve Harrison		
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>			
Project/Programme Manager Name			
Project/Programme Sponsor Name			

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	To stop paying the premium for the schools IT equipment insurance cover and cover the risk from the Council's Self Insurance Fund
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment: Financial Secondary Alignment:
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Benefit Category:
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	Comments:
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	Any school claim will be covered by the council rather than an external policy
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	None expected
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No
ESIA Guidance and template	
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	That insurers will be prepared to cancel cover with immediate effect and provide a full premium refund with no pro rata adjustment and that claims do not exceed the premium saving in the current or future years. The average cost of claims over the previous 5 years to 31/3/23 was £7.4k pa with insurers paying circa £2k pa. The single highest claim was £16k
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Yes - risk of loss of IT at schools exceeding the saving noting that the 23-24 premium is £11k and that the policy (subject to a £10k excess which is already met from the Self Insurance Fund) cover £9.75m of IT equipment on an all risks basis and provides cover for restoration or replacement of data and information (up to £350k) and additional expenditure (up to £500k)
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Relies on a dialogue with Council insurers for 2023/24 implementation
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>	
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	Either the policy can be self insured for 2023/24, or if not implemented immediately will be applied for 2024/25 (the assumed date is 1 April 2024)
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2023/24

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Liaison with Council insurers	Peter Rogers	After agreed	Ongoing monitoring
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
N/A					

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
0			11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by Steve Harrison Head of Financial Management and Planning
Date 1 June 2023

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	515	Created Date:	29/09/23	Last Review Date:	
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Facilities Management - To produce new target operating model to maximise opportunities				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Director of Customer Experience				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>					
Project/Programme Manager Name					
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	James Marshall				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Facilities Management - To produce new target operating model to maximise opportunities				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	A successful, sustainable organisation		Secondary Alignment:	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial			Benefit Category: Cost Savings	
Which of the SCC Cost Drivers does this proposal contribute to?	Primary cost driver:	System & Process		Secondary cost driver:	
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	A review of security and building management arrangements across council sites				
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>					
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No				
ESIA Guidance and template					
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	That the use and occupancy of the Civic Centre do not materially change over the coming years				
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>					
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	No				
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	Budget monitoring				
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2024/25				

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	A review of security and building management arrangements across council sites	James Marshall	01/11/2023	
2	Conduct restructure	James Marshall	01/01/2024	
3	Contract negotiations	James Marshall	01/01/2024	
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
£242,500	Apr-23	£142,000	2024/25	Ongoing	James Marshall

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by *Role and Name*

Signed of by Budget Champion *Role and Name*

Signed of by Finance BP *Role and Name*

Date

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	575	Created Date:	16/11/2023	Last Review Date:	16/11/2023
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Supplier Management and Procurement				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Paul Paskins				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	n/a				
Project/Programme Manager Name	Paul Paskins				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Mel Creighton				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	To produce a new target operating model in collaboration with the Integrated Commissioning Unit to ensure we are maximising opportunities, empowering our people to self-serve where appropriate and streamlining systems and processes				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	A successful, sustainable organisation		Secondary Alignment:	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial	Benefit Category: Cost Savings			
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	No	Comments:	New proposal - business plan to be revised		
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	All services who spend with third parties, have supplier contracts and/or procure				
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	Procurements are likely to be slower and services and works delivered through contracts may be poorer				
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No				
ESIA Guidance and template					
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	Completion of service redesign				
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Poorer and slower support may not be acceptable				
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Integrated Commissioning Unit review				
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	Revised Key Performance Indicators will be developed in line with the Procurement and Contract Management Strategy; these will measure the impact of this proposal				
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2024/25				

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Service Redesign	Paul Paskins	01/01/2024	01/10/2024
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e. FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
£0	£309,000	£309,000	£309,000	£309,000	£309,000

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by Paul Paskins
Date 16/11/2023

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique Identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	283	Created Date:	Last Review Date:
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Business Rates savings from the disposal of vacant council buildings		
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Ola Onabajo		
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	Savings Associated with Buildings and Disposals		
Project/Programme Manager <i>Name</i>	Tina Dyer-Slade		
Project/Programme Sponsor <i>Name</i>	Adam Wilkinson - Exec Director of Place		

Details

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	These savings relate to where Business Rates are paid on buildings that can be disposed of such as Church View, Kings Park Road former Citizen Advice Bureau building, 38-40 Commercial Road, Housing Office Lordshill, Public Conveniences at Portswood, 108 East Street and others.		
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment: A successful, sustainable organisation	Secondary Alignment: A successful, sustainable organisation	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial	Benefit Category: Cost Savings	
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	Yes	Comments:	
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	No impact		
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	Existing commitments will continue		
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No		
ESIA Guidance and template			
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	No		
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	There is a risk that it is not possible to dispose of the buildings that we are currently paying business rates on, especially by 1 April 2024 to remove the rates liability.		
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	No		
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>			
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	through financial performance, salary costs compared to income generated.		
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2023/24		

Enablers

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1				
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant)

2023/4	2024/5	2025/6	2026/7	2027/28	Target Period 6
	57,000	57,000	57,000	57,000	

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by	Tina Dyer-Slade - Corporate Estate and Assets
Date	06/06/2023

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	472	Created Date:	14/09/2023	Last Review Date:	16/11/2023
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Review Ranger Team including any income generating opportunities				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Dave Tyrrie				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>					
Project/Programme Manager Name					
Project/Programme Sponsor Name					

Details

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Review Ranger Team including any income generating opportunities and opportunities to reduce maintenance requirements through partnership with voluntary groups.				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:				Secondary Alignment:
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial				Benefit Category:
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	Comments:				
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	Links with wider city services / grounds maintenance etc.				
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	None identified				
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	Yes				
ESIA Guidance and template					
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>					
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Risk of limited income generation opportunities / capacity for voluntary groups to undertake work				
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>					
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>					
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>					

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Exploration of voluntary/income generating opportunities	District Ops	01/01/2023	
2	Implementation of new arrangements	District Ops	01/04/2023	
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e. FINANCIAL YEAR

Target Period 1	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
	68	68	68	68	68

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by <i>Role and Name</i>	Ian Collins
Date	16/11/2023

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique Identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	269	Created Date:	Last Review Date:
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	To simplify the itchen bridge tariff by replacing the current fees with a flat fee of £1 / 40p (smartcards)		
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Rosie Zambra / Ian COLLINS		
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>			
Project/Programme Manager Name			
Project/Programme Sponsor Name			

Details

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Proposal to amend toll to £1 non residents and 40p from non residents from February 2024		
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	Secondary Alignment:	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial	Benefit Category:	
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	Comments:		
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>			
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	Increased cost for bridge users.		
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No		
ESIA Guidance and template			
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	Needs to be progressed through traffic regulation order and is subject to public consultation.		
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Politically unpopular. TROs are expensive (ETBC) and signage requires changing therefore scaling increases annually will cost more than single larger increases that then remain stable.		
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Needs to be progressed through traffic regulation order and is subject to public consultation.		
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>			
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>			
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>			

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	(If agreed) - 42 day public consultation	service/comms	01/11/2023	
2	Analyse consultation feedback / cabinet decision / communicate outcome	service/comms	01/01/2024	
3	Put Traffic Regulation Order in place (21 days)	service		
4	Change signs etc to implement	service	01/02/2024	

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
£4.1m Toll income	Apr-23	£4.5m	Mar-27	Ongoing financial monitoring	

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	Target Period 6
72,000	300,000	428,000	428,000	428,000	

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by *Role and Name*

Date

Identification				
Saving ID Unique Identifier (Finance to provide)	551	Created Date:	16/11/2023	Last Review Date:
Saving Title Clear and succinct	Street Cleansing - review			
Saving owner: Role and Name	Dave Tyrie			
Project/Programme Name As in Project Online				
Project/Programme Manager Name				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name				

Details	
Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	There are vacant roles in street cleansing teams that are currently being covered by agency workers. The service's operating model will be reviewed and optimisation of routes will be undertaken to enable the deletion of c.5 vacant posts.
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment: _____ Secondary Alignment: _____
Benefit type Select from drop-down	Financial _____ Benefit Category: _____
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	Comments: no
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	Additional pressure on remaining team members / work related stress / risk of sickness absence
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	Potential for poorer quality public spaces / district centres and associated increase in service requests, call centre traffic, customer and councillor complaints.
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	
ESIA Guidance and template	
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Key officers in other teams (IT) are leaving on VS. This resource was required to implement digital route planning and achieve savings. Insufficient capacity left. This will now be a manual process that could take up to 6months or more to process. Risk of continued agency spend if optimisation unable to render significant efficiencies, or level of service not reduced.
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>	
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	

Delivery plan				
ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Review routes and operating model	District Ops	01/03/2024	
2	Implement new operating model	District Ops	01/04/2024	
3				
4				

Measurement						
Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>	

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR					
Target Period 1	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
	150	150	150	150	150

Sign-off	
This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:	
Signed off by Role and Name	Ian Collins
Date	16/11/2023

Identification

Benefit ID <i>Unique identifier</i>	Created Date: 14th March 2023	Last Review Date: 14th March 2023
Benefit Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Following consultation on the closure of Holcroft House residential home and reprovion for occupants elsewhere	
Benefit Owner <i>Role and Name</i>	Vernon Nosal	
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	ASC Transformation	
Project/Programme Manager Name	Alison Milton	
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Claire Edgar	

Details

Benefit Statement

Why is this a benefit? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?

A review of the use of accommodation provided by SCC may produce savings

Alignment to Strategic Objectives

Which objectives does this benefit support?

Primary Alignment:

Secondary Alignment:

Benefit Type

Select from drop-down

Financial

Benefit Category: Cost Savings

In Business Plan

If a financial benefit, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?

No

Comments:

This is a savings commitment for 24/25 and beyond

Primary Beneficiary

Who is going to use/benefit?

ASC budget

Other Stakeholders

Who else can impact of be impacted by this benefit?

ICB

Constraints & Assumptions

Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the benefit?

Closure in progress

Risks

Are there any risks to the realisation of the benefit?

Closure is progressing. Potential JR challenge regarding decision to close.

Dependencies

Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the benefit?

Comments

Use this space for any other comments

All residents to be relocated, provisional date = 31/11/23

Metric

How will we measure it?

Through cost reductions meonitored and measured.

Timescale for Realisation

What are the timescales for realisation of the benefit?

During project implementation

Enablers

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the benefit?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Reviews of all people in receipt of accommodation completed	Louise Ryan/Beccie Dries	Completed	01/09/2023
2	Placements requests completed.	Louise Ryan	Completed	
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the benefit?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
£1.3M	20/02/2023	£0	31/03/2024	TBC	Beccie Dries

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Benefits only; identify the period as relevant)

Target Period 1	Target Period 2	Target Period 3	Target Period 4	Target Period 5	Target Period 6
TBC	TBC	Full year effect assuming review completion by Nov = approx £400k - potential if closed on time	£400k	FYE = £1.3M (24/25)	

Sign-off

This Benefit Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by <i>Role and Name</i>	Vernon Nosal - Director, Operations, ASC
Date	10/11/2023

Identification

Benefit ID <i>Unique Identifier</i>	411	Created Date:	19/07/2023	Last Review Date:	
Benefit Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Increased income from client charges				
Benefit Owner <i>Role and Name</i>	Paula Johnston				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	ASC - Charging Policy				
Project/Programme Manager Name	Finance Workstream, Ambitious Futures programme				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Paula Johnston				

Details

Benefit Statement <i>Why is this a benefit? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Increased income offsets the cost of care packages and provides more funds for providing care to other customers.				
Alignment to Strategic Objectives <i>Which objectives does this benefit support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	A successful, sustainable organisation			Secondary Alignment:
Benefit Type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial	Benefit Category: Income Creation			
In Business Plan <i>If a financial benefit, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	No	Comments:	Finance aware, but will not be included in budget until public consultation and review is completed. Also, the amount of the increase is unpredictable so the amount declared is conservative and status of savings target is Red.		
Primary Beneficiary <i>Who is going to use/benefit?</i>	SCC				
Other Stakeholders <i>Who else can impact of be impacted by this benefit?</i>	Other customers (as more funding available)				
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the benefit?</i>	Assumes profile of customers' financial circumstances and care needs does not change significantly. Assumes go-live timeline not adversely affected by the number of other consultations happening at the same time Constraint: Income increases will be offset by increased uptake of "disability related expenses" which have the effect of reducing our income. This offset cannot be predicted as it depends on how many new people apply for DREs.				
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the benefit?</i>	Risk that DRE uptake is better than allowed for and reduces income more than expected. Customer don't pay the higher charges and bad debt increases Customers request reduced care to mitigate their increased costs Full-cost customers' assets deplete more quickly to the point when we have to fund them Reputational damage during public consultation leads to withdrawal of proposed policy changes which would generate the income Full-cost customers complain about back-dated charges caused by delayed provider rate uplifts.				
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the benefit?</i>	Decision-making timeline needs to align with budget timeline				
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	ASC income from client charges (via CareDirector and/or Business World)				
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the benefit?</i>	Up to 5 years post project completion				

Enablers

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the benefit?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	new policy goes live including the changes which will generate more income	Paula Johnston/Sandra Littler	01/04/2023	31/03/2024
2	Changes in day-to-day practices and system settings are made and embedded	Paula Johnston/Sandra Littler	01/10/2023	30/06/2024
3				
4				

Measurement

	Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the benefit?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
Client	tbc	Q1, 23-24	Increase of £200K per year	31/03/2026	Quarterly	Sourced from ASC Business Partner from Business World

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Benefits only; identify the period as relevant)

Target Period 1	Target Period 2	Target Period 3	Target Period 4	Target Period 5	Target Period 6
Increase of £200K in 24-25	Increase of £200K in 25-26				

Sign-off

This Benefit Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by *Role and Name*

Date

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique Identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	510	Created Date:	16/10/2023	Last Review Date:	16/10/2023
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Stronger Communities full deletion of existing vacant posts				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Chris Brown				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	N/A				
Project/Programme Manager Name	N/A				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	N/A				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	To delete from the establishment the following vacant posts: 2000009083 Engagement Officer - Armed Forces; 2000011153 East Area Engagement Officer; 2000011151 Community Grants & Fundraising Officer				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	A council built on strong foundations		Secondary Alignment: A place to invest and grow	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial	Benefit Category: Cost Savings			
In Business Plan <i>If a financial saving, it is included in the Business Plan for the related financial years?</i>	No	Comments:			
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	Work will be redistributed within remaining Stronger Communities staff, so no call on other SCC services.				
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	The savings will contribute to overall financial savings for SCC, with minimal impact on the public.				
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No.ESIA discussed with service, workloads are currently being absorbed and minimal impact expected				
ESIA Guidance and template					
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	No - the posts are already vacant. In year savings have been recognised through monitoring and cost control sheets already provided for July/October reporting.				
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	No				
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	No				
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	Through regular budget monitoring				
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2024/25				

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Consider whether an ESIA is required - complete if necessary			
2	Delete posts from HR establishment.			
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
£123,027	Oct-23	£0	2024/25	Ongoing	

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
0		£120,000	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by *Role and Name*

Date

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	511	Created Date:	06/11/2023	Last Review Date:	
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Repurposing of public health grant for employment support in delivery of public health outcomes (resulting in saving for ASC)				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Debbie Chase				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	PH grant assurance and use				
Project/Programme Manager Name	Kate Harvey/Charlotte Matthews				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Debbie Chase				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Repurposing of public health grant for employment support in delivery of public health outcomes (resulting in saving for ASC)				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	A successful, sustainable organisation		Secondary Alignment:	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial			Benefit Category: Cost Savings	
Which of the SCC Cost Drivers does this proposal contribute to?	Primary cost driver:	System & Process		Secondary cost driver:	
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	Grant allocated for this use so opportunity cost elsewhere				
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	Potential reduction in Public Health outcomes elsewhere				
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No	Not required			
ESIA Guidance and template	n/a				
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	Employment support offer must continue to align to public health outcomes and meet conditions of the grant use				
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Ensuring/evidencing appropriate use of Public Health grant				
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	None - in year saving only. Longer term savings dependent on either employment support service redesign or external funding (grants anticipated)				
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	Use of Public Health Grant				
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2023/24				

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	N/A			
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
	Oct-23		23/24	23/24 only	Finance

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
Saving of £38,000 from ASC					

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by <i>Role and Name</i>	
Signed by Budget Champion <i>Role and Name</i>	
Signed by Finance BP <i>Role and Name</i>	Paul Ring - FBP - ASC, ICU & Public Health
Date	

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	512	Created Date:	06/11/2023	Last Review Date:	
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Repurposing of public health grant for employment support in delivery of public health outcomes (resulting in saving for ICU)				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Debbie Chase				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	PH grant assurance and use				
Project/Programme Manager Name	Kate Harvey/Charlotte Matthews				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Debbie Chase				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Repurposing of public health grant for employment support in delivery of public health outcomes (resulting in saving for ICU)				
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment:	A successful, sustainable organisation		Secondary Alignment:	
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Financial			Benefit Category: Cost Savings	
Which of the SCC Cost Drivers does this proposal contribute to?	Primary cost driver:	System & Process		Secondary cost driver:	
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	Grant allocated for this use so opportunity cost elsewhere				
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	Potential reduction in Public Health outcomes elsewhere				
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	No	Not required			
ESIA Guidance and template					
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	Employment support offer must continue to align to public health outcomes and meet conditions of the grant use				
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	Ensuring/evidencing appropriate use of Public Health grant				
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	None - in year saving only. Longer term savings dependent on either employment support service redesign or external funding (grants anticipated)				
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>					
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	Use of Public Health Grant				
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2023/24				

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	N/A			
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
	Oct-23		23/24	23/24 only	Finance

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
Saving of £138,000 from ICU					

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by *Role and Name*

Signed off by Budget Champion *Role and Name*

Signed off by Finance BP *Role and Name*

Date

Paul Ring - FBP - ASC, ICU & Public Health

Identification

Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	513	Created Date:	17/10/2023	Last Review Date:	19/10/2023
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	SCC Mental Health Team not using NHS Southern Health accommodation				
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Claire Edgar				
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	ASC Mental Health S75 Withdrawal				
Project/Programme Manager Name	Gary Spencer-Humphrey				
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	Claire Edgar				

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)

Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	Currently ASC Mental Health staff use external NHS properties for office use across four sites (CMHT West - Cannon House, CMHT Central - College Keep, CMHT East Bittern Park Medical Centre and Antelope House Hospital). After the non-renewal of the Section 75 agreement with SHFT, the team will move to occupy the Civic Offices and no longer occupy any health-based buildings.
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment: A successful, sustainable organisation Secondary Alignment:
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Benefit Category: Cost Savings
Which of the SCC Cost Drivers does this proposal contribute to?	Primary cost driver: System & Process Secondary cost driver:
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	SCC will cost save c. £93k a year in a premises recharge to the 4 buildings listed above and SCC staff will return to the council on 01/04/2024 and occupy the first floor North Block (Civic Centre) along with all other ASC teams.
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	£93k not required for use of health buildings outside a s75 agreement.
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	Yes Completed as part of the full business case for the s75 non-renewal
ESIA Guidance and template	
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	We must vacate all SHFT buildings before 01/04/2024
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	No
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	None identified
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>	N/A
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2024/25

Delivery plan

ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	N/A			
2				
3				
4				

Measurement

Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
£93,000 annual rent	Oct-23				

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e FINANCIAL YEAR

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
	93,000	93,000	93,000	93,000	93,000

Sign-off

This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:

Signed off by <i>Role and Name</i>	Gary Spencer-Humphrey
Signed by Budget Champion <i>Role and Name</i>	
Signed by Finance BP <i>Role and Name</i>	Paul Ring
Date	

Identification	
Saving ID <i>Unique identifier (Finance to provide)</i>	Created Date: 9/11/23 Last Review Date:
Saving Title <i>Clear and succinct</i>	Increase council tax premium for: •second home owners and •empty homes after one year
Saving owner: <i>Role and Name</i>	Vanessa Shahani, Head, Income and Expenditure
Project/Programme Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	N/A BAU proposals
Project/Programme Manager Name <i>As in Project Online</i>	Vanessa Shahani, Head, Income and Expenditure
Project/Programme Sponsor Name	James Marshall, Director, Customer Experience

Details (please include any impact on FTEs)	
Saving statement <i>What is the saving? What do we want to achieve? What is SCC getting out of it?</i>	The proposals are to: •introduce a council tax premium of 100% on second homes (subject to legislation being approved) •introduce a council tax premium of 100% where a property has been empty for more than 12 months (subject to legislation being approved)
Alignment to strategic objectives <i>Which objectives does this saving support?</i>	Primary Alignment: Financial Secondary Alignment: A successful, sustainable organisation
Benefit type <i>Select from drop-down</i>	Benefit Category: Income Creation
Which of the SCC Cost Drivers does this proposal contribute to?	Primary cost driver: System & Process Secondary cost driver: System & Process
Impact of saving - SCC <i>What other SCC services will be impacted by this saving?</i>	This could have implications for the Customer Payment and Debt Team, who collect a range of other income/recover debt including rents from council tenants. It could mean that council tax collection is improved at the expense of other income streams. It could also increase workload for the Welfare Rights and Money Advice Unit - if more tenants struggle with their bills as a result of this increase. They are currently finding it difficult to meet current volumes and this could increase pressure on the service.
Impact of Saving - Resident/Business/Visitors <i>How will this saving impact on residents, businesses or visitors?</i>	The proposal will impact people with second homes and those with properties that have been empty for more than 12 months. As of 27 September 2023, there are 906 properties currently registered as being unoccupied and furnished, and therefore potentially second homes. Most are within council tax bands A to C. This means doubling the council tax that they will have to pay. As of 27 September 2023, there are currently 278 properties that have been empty for between 12 months and 24 months. Most are within council tax bands A to C
Equality Safety Impact Assessment completed for this saving	Yes
ESIA Guidance and template	
Constraints & Assumptions <i>Are there any constraints or assumptions for achieving the saving?</i>	See section on risks below.
Risks <i>Are there any risks to the realisation of the saving?</i>	The risks linked to this proposal are that the additional premiums might encourage people to sell or rent their properties which would increase availability of housing stock to rent or buy but would decrease income to the council. The potential additional income was calculated using September 2023 figures as a baseline and as/f numbers change then the additional income will change. Also people might not pay, meaning more debt for the council to collect rather than additional revenue. These factors mean it is incredibly difficult to forecast additional income accurately.
Dependencies <i>Are there any dependencies (e.g. projects, policies) to the realisation of the saving?</i>	None known at this time.
Comments <i>Use this space for any other comments</i>	None identified at time of writing this proposal Decisions linked to introducing a council tax premium on second homes need 12 months notice so the earliest these could be implemented is the 1 April 2025, providing the decision to implement a premium from 1 April 2025 was made prior to 1 April 2024. Varying the scheme for properties that have been empty between 12 months and 2 years requires a decision "before the beginning of the year" and needs to be published in at least one local newspaper in the area within 21 days of the decision being made. The ability to introduce these additional premiums is captured in the Levelling up and Regeneration Act 2023 which received Royal Assent on 26 October 2023. It should be noted that the Revenues and Benefits Service currently has the following unachievable annual income targets a.£160,000 increased collection council tax (highlighted in MTFS) b.£770,500 income from court fees (£168,638 achieved as of 31st August 23) If approved the proposals would result in a change to the estimated council tax base.
Metric <i>How will we measure it?</i>	In year collection rates
Timescale for Realisation <i>What are the timescales for realisation of the saving?</i>	2024/25

Delivery plan				
ID	Change in work practice or process / Project outcome <i>What needs to happen to enable the saving?</i>	Who <i>Who is responsible for that change / outcome?</i>	Start date <i>When is it expected to start?</i>	Due by <i>When is it expected to end?</i>
1	Approval of proposals to introduce additional premiums for second homes and properties empty longer than 12 months (legislation dependent)	Council	01/04/2024	Ongoing
2				
3				
4				

Measurement					
Baseline <i>What is the current value of the metric?</i>	Baseline Date <i>When was the baseline value taken?</i>	Target <i>What is the new value we want to achieve?</i>	Target End Date <i>By when do we want to achieve the full target?</i>	Frequency of Measurement <i>How frequently are we going to measure the saving?</i>	Source / Evidence / Comments <i>Where can we find more information about the source / evidence storage or who to consult?</i>
introduce 100% council tax premium for homes that are empty between 12 and 24 months - legislation dependent	27/09/2023	£357K	31/03/2025	Monthly	Andrew Armour, Revenues and Benefits Manager
		£267.8K	31/03/2026	Monthly	Andrew Armour, Revenues and Benefits Manager
		£200.6K	31/03/2027	Monthly	Andrew Armour, Revenues and Benefits Manager
Introduce additional Council Tax premium for second homes - legislation dependent	27/09/2023	£1,190 K	31/03/2026	Monthly	Andrew Armour, Revenues and Benefits Manager
		£892.5K	31/03/2027	Monthly	Andrew Armour, Revenues and Benefits Manager

Financial Breakdown (applicable to Financial Saving only; identify the period as relevant) i.e. FINANCIAL YEAR					
Target Period 1	Target Period 2	Target Period 3	Target Period 4	Target Period 5	Target Period 6
see above					

Sign-off	
This Saving Profile has been reviewed and signed-off by:	
Signed off by <i>Role and Name</i>	Vanessa Shahani, Head, Income and Expenditure
Signed of by Budget Champion <i>Role and Name</i>	
Signed of by Finance BP <i>Role and Name</i>	
Date	