

Cabinet

Background Papers

Date: **Thursday 11 February 2021**

KEY 12. Final Revenue Budget 2021/22 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 - 2023/24 (Pages 3 - 60)

Background papers to the report of the Director of Finance.

Scan this code for the electronic agenda:



This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)



You will need to produce an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) if:

- You are developing a new policy, strategy, or service
- You are making changes that will affect front-line services
- You are reducing budgets, which may affect front-line services
- You are changing the way services are funded and this may impact the quality of the service and who can access it
- You are making a decision that could have a different impact on different groups of people
- You are making staff redundant or changing their roles

Guidance notes on how to complete an EqIA and sign off process are available on the Hub under Equality and Diversity. You must read the [guidance notes](#) and ensure you have followed all stages of the EqIA approval process (outlined in appendix 1). Section 2 of the template requires you to undertake an assessment of the impact of your proposals on groups with protected characteristics. Equalities and borough profile data, as well as other sources of statistical information can be found on the Harrow hub, within the section entitled: [Equality Impact Assessment](#) - sources of statistical information.

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Type of Decision:	<input type="radio"/> Cabinet <input type="radio"/> Portfolio holder <input checked="" type="radio"/> Other (state)	
Title of Proposal	Removal of base budget for 4 staffing positions at Headstone Manor and Museum from October 2020	Date EqIA created - 25/10/19
Name and job title of completing/lead Officer	Tim Bryan – Head of Service, Culture and Leisure	
Directorate/ Service responsible		
Organisational approval		
EqIA approved by Directorate Equalities Lead	Name Dave Corby	Signature <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tick this box to indicate that you have approved this EqIA Date of approval 6th November 2019

4

1. Summary of proposal, impact on groups with protected characteristics and mitigating actions
(to be completed after you have completed sections 2 - 5)

a) What is your proposal? To remove the base budget for 4 staffing positions at Headstone Manor and Museum from October 2020. The posts are: Community Engagement Officer, Youth and Families Engagement Officer, Outdoor Learning Officer, and Digitisation Project Officer. These posts were created as part of the restoration of the museum project which received significant capital funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund. The salary costs of these posts are £135k (£91k funded from Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) until September 2020 and £44k from the Council). These posts were intended to ensure that the restored museum was accessible to the whole community especially those from target groups which have traditionally been hard to reach audiences. These groups include families and children. If no alternative external funding can be secured these posts will be deleted.

b) Summarise the impact of your proposal on groups with protected characteristics The only protected characteristic that it is believed that these proposals would have an impact on is age, particularly on young people and families.

c) Summarise any potential negative impact(s) identified and mitigating actions It is believed that there would be a minor negative impact on young people and families. It would be intended to maintain the engagement networks and activities established for this target group by the work of the posts to be deleted especially by the Youth and Families Engagement Officer now that they have been set up. Applications for external grant funding to support delivery of activities to this target group will also be made as appropriate. Regular family events and work with schools including a project loan collection were in place before the 4 posts partially funded by HLF started.

5

2. Assessing impact																							
You are required to undertake a detailed analysis of the impact of your proposals on groups with protected characteristics. You should refer to borough profile data , equalities data , service user information, consultation responses and any other relevant data/evidence to help you assess and explain what impact (if any) your proposal(s) will have on each group. Where there are gaps in data, you should state this in the boxes below and what action (if any), you will take to address this in the future.		What does the evidence tell you about the impact your proposal may have on groups with protected characteristics? Click the relevant box to indicate whether your proposal will have a positive impact, negative (minor, major), or no impact																					
Protected characteristic	For each protected characteristic, explain in detail what the evidence is suggesting and the impact of your proposal (if any). Click the appropriate box on the right to indicate the outcome of your analysis.	Positive impact	Negative impact		No impact																		
			Minor	Major																			
Age	<p>The resident population of Harrow according to the 2018 mid-year population estimates was 250,149. Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2018 mid-year population data by age for the whole borough was as follows:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0-4 year olds</td> <td>17,745</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5-19 year olds</td> <td>45,630</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20-24 year olds</td> <td>13,528</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25-49 year olds</td> <td>89,685</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50-59 year olds</td> <td>31,204</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-74 year olds</td> <td>33,943</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75-89 year olds</td> <td>12,736</td> </tr> <tr> <td>90 years old and over</td> <td>2,148</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Total	0-4 year olds	17,745	5-19 year olds	45,630	20-24 year olds	13,528	25-49 year olds	89,685	50-59 year olds	31,204	60-74 year olds	33,943	75-89 year olds	12,736	90 years old and over	2,148	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Age Group	Total																						
0-4 year olds	17,745																						
5-19 year olds	45,630																						
20-24 year olds	13,528																						
25-49 year olds	89,685																						
50-59 year olds	31,204																						
60-74 year olds	33,943																						
75-89 year olds	12,736																						
90 years old and over	2,148																						

	<p>The age breakdown of the 4 staff at Headstone Manor and Museum who are affected by this proposal is as follows: 18-24 = ; 25-34 = ; 35-44 = 0; 45-54 = 0; 55+ = 0</p> <p>In 2018-19 there were 51,666 visitors to the museum. 7,827 people took part in the family activities (including Mini Museum for Under 5s, trails and workshops). There were 4,780 visits from school children.</p> <p>The greatest impact of these proposals is likely to be a reduction in the number of people visiting the museum particularly by young people and families. Engagement work with local schools also likely to decrease.</p> <p>Regular family events and work with schools including a project loan service were in place before the posts partially funded by Heritage Lottery Funded (HLF) started.</p> <p>The ages of the affected staff range from 22 to 31. The staffing reduction will be carried out according to the appropriate Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.</p>				
Disability	<p>There are approximately 15,000 people aged 16 to 64 with moderate or serious physical disability living in Harrow and this number is predicted to increase to 16,000 by 2020. These trends are similar to those predicted for London with the largest proportion increases being in the 55 to 64 age group (Harrow Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2015-20). The total population aged 18-64 in Harrow predicted to have a learning disability in 2017 is 3,466 (Information taken from: www.pansi.org.uk).</p> <p>The 2011 census showed there were 24,620 carers in Harrow, an increase of over 4,000 (almost 20%) from ten years earlier. The reasons for providing care vary and can include more than one reason. In the Harrow Carers' Survey, the 3 out of 5 carers were caring for someone with a physical disability. 45% of Harrow carers were caring for an older person which is significantly higher than the national average. Around 1 in 5 were caring for someone with a mental health problems and a similar proportion for someone with a learning disability. It is difficult to estimate the number of young carers although the 2011 Census shows 2,272 self-declared young carers aged 0 – 24 years old in Harrow. The vast majority of these are hidden, i.e. not known to social care or receiving any support (Harrow Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2015-20).</p> <p>None of the 4 staff at Headstone Manor and Museum affected by these proposals are known to have a disability. The staffing reduction will be carried out according to the appropriate Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	It is not anticipated that these proposals will have a specific impact on people who have a disability. The recent restoration of the Museum ensured that the museum is accessible to those with a disability and meets the required disability legislation.				
Gender reassignment	<p>The only data Harrow currently has on Gender Reassignment is via the Analysis of demand from housing applicants (via Locata): 1 (0.02%) housing applicant has indicated that they are transgender. (Data as at April 2014).</p> <p>None of the staff that would be impacted by this proposal indicated that they were part of this protected characteristic. This proposal will be carried out according to the appropriate Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that these proposals will have a specific impact on people from this protected characteristic.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<p>Census data: Harrow has a very high percentage of married couples, with 53.7% of residents aged 16 and older declaring they were in a marriage in 2011. This is above the national level of 46.6%. There was a 27% increase in the number of married people living in Harrow between 2001 and 2011 (Office for National Statistics, 2001 and 2011). Between their inception and January 2012, 107 civil partnership ceremonies took place in Harrow.</p> <p>Of the 4 museum staff affected by these proposals 1 indicated that they are single, and 1 that they are married. These proposals will be carried out according to the Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that these proposals will have a specific impact on people from this protected characteristic.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy and Maternity	<p>The 2018 mid-year estimates showed an increase of 31 births (3,655 births in total) over 2017 mid-year estimates, a 0.86% increase. There was a consistent increase from 2001/02 to 2012/13.</p> <p>Of the 4 museum staff affected by these proposals one is currently on maternity leave.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<p>These proposals will be carried out according to the Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that these proposals will have a specific impact on people from this protected characteristic.</p>																									
<p>Race/ Ethnicity</p>	<p>Census data (2011) shows the ethnic breakdown for Harrow to be as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 486 1167 916"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnic Group</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White British</td> <td>73,826</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Other</td> <td>27,165</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mixed</td> <td>9,499</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian or Asian British</td> <td>101,808</td> <td>43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black or Black British</td> <td>19,708</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arab and Other Group</td> <td>7,050</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It is not anticipated that these proposals will have a specific impact on people from this protected characteristic.</p> <p>The ethnic groups of the 4 staff affected who indicated their ethnic origin is as follows: White – British = 2 White – Other =1</p> <p>These proposals will be carried out according to the Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.</p>	Ethnic Group	Total	Percentage	White British	73,826	31%	White Other	27,165	11%	Mixed	9,499	4%	Asian or Asian British	101,808	43%	Black or Black British	19,708	8%	Arab and Other Group	7,050	3%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ethnic Group	Total	Percentage																								
White British	73,826	31%																								
White Other	27,165	11%																								
Mixed	9,499	4%																								
Asian or Asian British	101,808	43%																								
Black or Black British	19,708	8%																								
Arab and Other Group	7,050	3%																								

<p>Religion or belief</p>	<p>Harrow is Britain's most religiously diverse community and enjoys the Country's highest density of Gujarati Hindus and Sri Lankan Tamils, alongside significant Muslim, Jewish and Christian communities. The Greater London Authority (GLA) Diversity Indices rank Harrow seventh highest nationally for ethnic diversity and second for religious diversity.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that these proposals will have a specific impact on people from this protected characteristic.</p> <p>Of the staff affected by these proposals 2 indicated that they had no religion/were atheist.</p> <p>These proposals will be carried out according to the Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Gender</p>	<p>ONS data: In the mid-year estimate 2018, 50% (125,133) of Harrow residents were male and 50% (125,016) are female. The first year where males have exceeded females.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that these proposals will have a specific impact on people from this protected characteristic.</p> <p>All 4 museum staff that would be affected by these proposals are female.</p> <p>These proposals will be carried out according to the Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Sexual Orientation</p>	<p>Although sexual orientation is a protected characteristic under equalities legislation, there is no robust data on the numbers of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in the population as no national census has ever asked people to define their sexuality. The Government estimates that 5-7% of the population are lesbians, gay men or bisexual. Stonewall, a UK charity supporting LGB rights, agrees with this estimate.</p> <p>2 staff who would be affected by these proposals indicated that they are</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	heterosexual/straight. The staff restructure will be carried out according to the Council's management of change policy and equalities policy.				
--	--	--	--	--	--

2.1 Cumulative impact – considering what else is happening within the Council and Harrow as a whole, could your proposals have a cumulative impact on groups with protected characteristics?

Yes No

If you clicked the Yes box, which groups with protected characteristics could be affected and what is the potential impact? Include details in the space below

2.2 Any other impact - considering what else is happening nationally/locally (national/local/regional policies, socio-economic factors etc), could your proposals have an impact on individuals/service users, or other groups?

Yes No

If you clicked the Yes box, Include details in the space below

3. Actions to mitigate/remove negative impact

Only complete this section if your assessment (in section 2) suggests that your proposals may have a negative impact on groups with protected characteristics. If you have not identified any negative impacts, please complete sections 4 and 5.

In the table below, please state what these potential negative impact (s) are, mitigating actions and steps taken to ensure that these measures will address and remove any negative impacts identified and by when. Please also state how you will monitor the impact of your proposal once implemented.

11

State what the negative impact(s) are for each group, identified in section 2. In addition, you should also consider and state potential risks associated with your proposal.	Measures to mitigate negative impact (provide details, including details of and additional consultation undertaken/to be carried out in the future). If you are unable to identify measures to mitigate impact, please state so and provide a brief explanation.	What action (s) will you take to assess whether these measures have addressed and removed any negative impacts identified in your analysis? Please provide details. If you have previously stated that you are unable to identify measures to mitigate impact please state below.	Deadline date	Lead Officer
<p>Potential minor impact on young people and families – potential for fewer people from these age groups to attend the museum as this was one of the key audience groups targeted by the roles that would be deleted under this proposal – in particular the Youth and Families Engagement Officer and the Community Engagement Officer.</p>	<p>The affected posts were set up after the completion of the restoration of the museum partially funded by HLF with the aim of establishing suitable activities for target audiences including young people and activities and ensuring that suitable activities were put in place for this age group. It is intended that the engagement networks and activities established will be sustained as much as possible within the remaining resources now that they are already in place, and that applications for external grant funding will be made to sustain service delivery to young people and families as appropriate both prior to the end of the current HLF funding period and afterwards.</p> <p>Regular family events and work with schools including a project loan service were in place before the 4 posts partially funded by HLF started.</p>	<p>Statistics of young people and families visiting the museum will continue to be recorded to assess the impact of the proposed removal of these 4 posts, and the measures taken to mitigate the impact</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Kerry Blackburn</p>

4. Public Sector Equality Duty

How does your proposal meet the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to:

1. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
2. Advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups
3. Foster good relations between people from different groups

Include details in the space below

Headstone Manor and Museum will continue to provide services to the whole community including all ages, ethnic and religious groups, and all the other protected characteristics. There will continue to be activities targeted at specific groups provided, and opportunities for people from different groups to participate in activities together.

5. Outcome of the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) click the box that applies

<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome 1 No change required: the EqlA has not identified any potential for unlawful conduct or disproportionate impact and all opportunities to advance equality of opportunity are being addressed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcome 2 Adjustments to remove/mitigate negative impacts identified by the assessment, or to better advance equality, as stated in section 3&4
<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome 3 This EqlA has identified discrimination and/ or missed opportunities to advance equality and/or foster good relations. However, it is still reasonable to continue with the activity. Outline the reasons for this and the information used to reach this decision in the space below.
Include details here

You will need to produce an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) if:

- You are developing a new policy, strategy, or service
- You are making changes that will affect front-line services
- You are reducing budgets, which may affect front-line services
- You are changing the way services are funded and this may impact the quality of the service and who can access it
- You are making a decision that could have a different impact on different groups of people
- You are making staff redundant or changing their roles

15

Guidance notes on how to complete an EqIA and sign off process are available on the Hub under Equality and Diversity. You must read the [guidance notes](#) and ensure you have followed all stages of the EqIA approval process (outlined in appendix 1). Section 2 of the template requires you to undertake an assessment of the impact of your proposals on groups with protected characteristics. Equalities and borough profile data, as well as other sources of statistical information can be found on the Harrow hub, within the section entitled: [Equality Impact Assessment](#) - sources of statistical information.

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)		
Type of Decision:	<input type="radio"/> Cabinet <input checked="" type="radio"/> Portfolio holder <input type="radio"/> Other (state)	
Title of Proposal	Divisional Directorates Restructure Environment & Culture and Commissioning & Commercial Services	Date EqIA created 30 November 2020
Name and job title of completing/lead Officer	Michael Butler Interim Director of Environmental Services	
Directorate/ Service responsible	Resources	
Organisational approval		
EqIA approved by Directorate Equalities Lead	Name: Paul Walker	Signature <input type="checkbox"/> Tick this box to indicate that you have approved this EqIA Date of approval

1. Summary of proposal, impact on groups with protected characteristics and mitigating actions

(to be completed after you have completed sections 2 - 5)

a) Management Proposal

The two existing Divisions have been without Directors for some time now. An Interim Director has been in post since October 2019 to ensure suitable leadership is provided to staff in both Divisional Directorates. During this time temporary changes to the structure and reporting lines have been implemented in order to ensure that the services continued to be delivered.

In addition, a financial review has been undertaken of both Directorates which has been in line with overall Council objectives to reduce net spending. This review now seeks to address the finances and structures of both Divisions in line with Council's overall service development, delivery and financial requirements.

Phased Implementation of the Proposed Restructure

The proposal is that the restructure will be managed across separate phases covering all grades of employees from the management team (Heads of Service) downwards and across operational teams within Environmental Services. Details of affected employees and operational teams will be revealed at the formal consultation processes as each Phase is formally launched.

Reduction in Roles

This EqIA is completed for Phase 1 of the proposed restructure which affects five Head of Service employees within the senior management team. There are currently seven Head of Service roles and the proposal is to reduce that to six Head of Service roles and to delete all current vacant posts within the senior management team. There are five new roles proposed within the new structure four of which are Heads of Service roles.

b) Summarise the impact of your proposal on groups with protected characteristics

No negative impact has been identified for affected employees in the age, gender, ethnicity origin and disability, protected characteristics as detailed in C below. All five affected employees have an equal opportunity and accessibility to the new posts in the proposed new structure and all have been ringfenced for interviews to appropriate and relevant opportunities in the new structure.

c) Summarise any potential negative impact(s) identified and mitigating actions

No negative impact has been identified for affected employees in the age, gender, ethnicity origin and disability, protected characteristics as detailed in C below. All five affected employees have an equal opportunity and accessibility to the new posts in the proposed new structure and all have been ringfenced for interviews to appropriate and relevant opportunities in the new structure.

2. Assessing impact																													
You are required to undertake a detailed analysis of the impact of your proposals on groups with protected characteristics. You should refer to borough profile data , equalities data , service user information, consultation responses and any other relevant data/evidence to help you assess and explain what impact (if any) your proposal(s) will have on each group. Where there are gaps in data, you should state this in the boxes below and what action (if any), you will take to address this in the future.		What does the evidence tell you about the impact your proposal may have on groups with protected characteristics? Click the relevant box to indicate whether your proposal will have a positive impact, negative (minor, major), or no impact																											
Protected characteristic	For each protected characteristic, explain in detail what the evidence is suggesting and the impact of your proposal (if any). Click the appropriate box on the right to indicate the outcome of your analysis.	Positive impact	Negative impact		No impact																								
			Minor	Major																									
Age	<p>The age profile of five staff affected at Phase 1 of the proposed management restructure</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>AGE RANGE</th> <th>TOTAL</th> <th>PERCENTAGE %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>20-29</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>30-39</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: yellow;"> <td>40-49</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50-59</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-69</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70-79</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>GRAND TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The highest percentage within the affected staff is within the 40 - 49 age bracket. This is comparable to the breakdown of the highest group within the overall profile of MG grades within the Community Directorate which is within the 50 – 59 age range.</p> <p>Given these are higher graded posts the highest percentage age range within this group is not surprising. There is no impact.</p>	AGE RANGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE %	20-29			30-39	1	20%	40-49	2	40%	50-59	1	20%	60-69	1	20%	70-79			GRAND TOTAL	5	100%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
AGE RANGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE %																											
20-29																													
30-39	1	20%																											
40-49	2	40%																											
50-59	1	20%																											
60-69	1	20%																											
70-79																													
GRAND TOTAL	5	100%																											

	<p>The age breakdown of the overall profile of MG grades within the Community Directorate.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="654 293 1408 528"> <thead> <tr> <th>AGE RANGE</th> <th>TOTAL</th> <th>PERCENTAGE %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>20 - 29</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>30 - 39</td> <td>3</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40 - 49</td> <td>12</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50 - 59</td> <td>28</td> <td>55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60 - 69</td> <td>8</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70 - 79</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>GRAND TOTAL</td> <td>51</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AGE RANGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE %	20 - 29			30 - 39	3	6%	40 - 49	12	23%	50 - 59	28	55%	60 - 69	8	16%	70 - 79			GRAND TOTAL	51	100%				
AGE RANGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE %																											
20 - 29																													
30 - 39	3	6%																											
40 - 49	12	23%																											
50 - 59	28	55%																											
60 - 69	8	16%																											
70 - 79																													
GRAND TOTAL	51	100%																											
<p>Disability</p>	<p>The disability breakdown profile of the five affected staff at Phase 1 by the proposed management restructure.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="734 630 1328 746"> <thead> <tr> <th>DISABILITY Y OR N</th> <th>PERCENTAGE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>None of the affected staff are disabled. There is no impact.</p> <p>The disability breakdown of the overall profile of MG grades within the Community Directorate.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="741 850 1323 1082"> <thead> <tr> <th>DISABILITY DESCRIPTION</th> <th>TOTALS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer not to say</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(blank)</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>51</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DISABILITY Y OR N	PERCENTAGE	N	100%	Grand Total	100%	DISABILITY DESCRIPTION	TOTALS	No	28	Prefer not to say		Yes	4	(blank)	19	Grand Total	51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
DISABILITY Y OR N	PERCENTAGE																												
N	100%																												
Grand Total	100%																												
DISABILITY DESCRIPTION	TOTALS																												
No	28																												
Prefer not to say																													
Yes	4																												
(blank)	19																												
Grand Total	51																												
<p>Gender reassignment</p>	<p>The Gender reassignment profile of staff affected by the proposed management restructure:</p> <p>None of the affected staff indicated that their gender identity was different to that assigned at birth. There is no impact.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="752 1222 1312 1374"> <thead> <tr> <th>GENDER REASSIGNMENT Y or N</th> <th>PERCENTAGE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	GENDER REASSIGNMENT Y or N	PERCENTAGE	N	100%	Grand Total	100%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																		
GENDER REASSIGNMENT Y or N	PERCENTAGE																												
N	100%																												
Grand Total	100%																												

Marriage and Civil Partnership

The Marriage and Civil Partnership profile of the five staff affected by the proposed management restructure.

MARITAL STATUS	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES
Sep.	1	20%
CivPar		
Div.		
Marr.	4	80%
Single		
Unknwn		
Wid.		
(blank)		
Grand Total	5	100%

The overall profile for MG grades in the Community Directorate

Marital Status	Total	%
Separated	1	2%
Civil Partnership		
Divorced.	1	2%
Married	32	63%
Single	9	18%
Not Specified	8	15%
Grand Total	51	100.00%

The highest percentage within the affected staff group is within the married bracket which compares to the highest group within the overall profile for MG grades within the Community Directorate.

Given these are higher graded posts the highest percentage within this group is not surprising. There is no impact.

Pregnancy and Maternity	From the current profile data for staff affected by the proposed management restructure there are no staff who are either pregnant or on maternity leave at the moment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Race/
Ethnicity

The Race / Ethnicity profile of the five affected staff of the proposed management restructure

All Ethnicities	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES
Asian - Bangladeshi	1	20%
White - English	3	60%
Unknown	1	20%
Grand Total	5	100%

The overall profile of MG grades within the Community Directorate

Ethnic origin	Number	Percentage
White - English	27	52%
Asian - Indian	7	14%
Unknown	1	2%
Asian - Sri Lankan		
Mixed - Other		
White - Other	6	12%
Asian - Afghani		
Asian - Bangladeshi	1	2%
Asian - Pakistani		
Black - African	1	2%
White - Irish	3	6%
Asian - Chinese		
Black - Other		
Black - Somali		
Black - Black Caribbean	4	8%
Mixed - Black and White Caribbean		
Other - any other ethnic group		
White - Polish		
White - Romanian		
White - Scottish		
White - Welsh	1	2%
Total (All Groups)	51	100.00%

Quality Impact Assessment Template - November 2018

The highest percentage within the affected staff is White English which compares to the highest group in the overall MG grade in the Community Directorate. There is no impact.

Religion or belief	The Religious / Belief group profile of the five staff affected by the proposed management restructure.																																										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Religion</th> <th>TOTALS</th> <th>PERCENTAGES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Christianity</td> <td>3</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Islam</td> <td>1</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No Religion/Atheist</td> <td>1</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Religion	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES	Christianity	3	60%	Islam	1	20%	No Religion/Atheist	1	20%	Grand Total	5	100%																											
Religion	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES																																									
Christianity	3	60%																																									
Islam	1	20%																																									
No Religion/Atheist	1	20%																																									
Grand Total	5	100%																																									
	The overall Harrow Council staff Religious / Belief group profiles:																																										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>RELIGION</th> <th>Total</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Buddhism</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Christianity</td> <td>24</td> <td>47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hinduism</td> <td>2</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Islam</td> <td>1</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jainism</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Judaism</td> <td>2</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No Religion/Atheist</td> <td>2</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sikh</td> <td>1</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoroastrian</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(blank)</td> <td>19</td> <td>37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>51</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	RELIGION	Total	%	Buddhism			Christianity	24	47%	Hinduism	2	4%	Islam	1	2%	Jainism			Judaism	2	4%	No Religion/Atheist	2	4%	Other			Sikh	1	2%	Zoroastrian			(blank)	19	37%	Grand Total	51	100%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
RELIGION	Total	%																																									
Buddhism																																											
Christianity	24	47%																																									
Hinduism	2	4%																																									
Islam	1	2%																																									
Jainism																																											
Judaism	2	4%																																									
No Religion/Atheist	2	4%																																									
Other																																											
Sikh	1	2%																																									
Zoroastrian																																											
(blank)	19	37%																																									
Grand Total	51	100%																																									
	<p>The highest percentage within the affected staff is Christianity which compares to the highest declared group in the overall MG grade in the Community Directorate. There is no impact.</p> <p>Some general indicators worth noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GLA's Religious Diversity Indices show that Harrow is London's second more religiously 				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																																						

	<p>diverse borough after Redbridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Census 2011 – Religious affiliation is very high in Harrow with Harrow having the second lowest number of residents who stated that they have no religion after Newham. • Christianity identified as Harrow’s most common religion with 37.3% followers. 25.3% of Harrow’s residents 																												
<p>Sex</p>	<p>The Gender group profile of the five staff affected by the proposed management restructure.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 464 1061 663"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>TOTALS</th> <th>PERCENTAGES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>2</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>3</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The highest percentage within the affected staff is male at 60% to 40% female. This compares to 59% males and 41% female gender split within the overall MG grade in the Community Directorate. There is no impact.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 837 1061 1031"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>TOTALS</th> <th>PERCENTAGES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>21</td> <td>41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>30</td> <td>59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>51</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gender	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES	Female	2	40%	Male	3	60%	Grand Total	5	100%	Gender	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES	Female	21	41%	Male	30	59%	Grand Total	51	100%	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
Gender	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES																											
Female	2	40%																											
Male	3	60%																											
Grand Total	5	100%																											
Gender	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES																											
Female	21	41%																											
Male	30	59%																											
Grand Total	51	100%																											

Sexual Orientation	The Sexual Orientation group profile of five staff affected by the proposed management restructure																													
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sexual Orientation</th> <th>TOTALS</th> <th>PERCENTAGES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bisexual</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gay/Lesbian</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: yellow;">Hetrosexual / Straight</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer not to say</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(blank)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sexual Orientation	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES	Bisexual			Gay/Lesbian			Hetrosexual / Straight	4	80%	Other			Prefer not to say	1	20%	(blank)			Grand Total	5	100%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sexual Orientation	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES																												
Bisexual																														
Gay/Lesbian																														
Hetrosexual / Straight	4	80%																												
Other																														
Prefer not to say	1	20%																												
(blank)																														
Grand Total	5	100%																												
The profile data relating to sexual orientation groups for MG grades within the Community Directorate are:																														
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SEXUAL ORIENTATION</th> <th>TOTAL</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bisexual</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gay/Lesbian</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: yellow;">Hetrosexual/Straight</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> <td style="text-align: center;">49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer not to say</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blank</td> <td style="text-align: center;">23</td> <td style="text-align: center;">45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">51</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			SEXUAL ORIENTATION	TOTAL	%	Bisexual			Gay/Lesbian	1	2%	Hetrosexual/Straight	25	49%	Other			Prefer not to say	2	4%	Blank	23	45%	Grand Total	51	100.00%				
SEXUAL ORIENTATION	TOTAL	%																												
Bisexual																														
Gay/Lesbian	1	2%																												
Hetrosexual/Straight	25	49%																												
Other																														
Prefer not to say	2	4%																												
Blank	23	45%																												
Grand Total	51	100.00%																												
<p>The highest percentage within the affected staff is Hetrosexual/Straight which compares to the highest group in the overall MG grade within the Community Directorate. There is no impact.</p>																														

2.1 Cumulative impact – considering what else is happening within the Council and Harrow as a whole, could your proposals have a cumulative impact on groups with protected characteristics?

Yes No

If you clicked the Yes box, which groups with protected characteristics could be affected and what is the potential impact? Include details in the space below

2.2 Any other impact - considering what else is happening nationally/locally (national/local/regional policies, socio-economic factors etc), could your proposals have an impact on individuals/service users, or other groups?

Yes No

If you clicked the Yes box, Include details in the space below

3. Actions to mitigate/remove negative impact

Only complete this section if your assessment (in section 2) suggests that your proposals may have a negative impact on groups with protected characteristics. If you have not identified any negative impacts, please complete sections 4 and 5.

In the table below, please state what these potential negative impact (s) are, mitigating actions and steps taken to ensure that these measures will address and remove any negative impacts identified and by when. Please also state how you will monitor the impact of your proposal once implemented.

State what the negative impact(s) are for each group, identified in section 2. In addition, you should also consider and state potential risks associated with your proposal.	Measures to mitigate negative impact (provide details, including details of and additional consultation undertaken/to be carried out in the future). If you are unable to identify measures to mitigate impact, please state so and provide a brief explanation.	What action (s) will you take to assess whether these measures have addressed and removed any negative impacts identified in your analysis? Please provide details. If you have previously stated that you are unable to identify measures to mitigate impact please state below.	Deadline date	Lead Officer
N/A				

4. Public Sector Equality Duty

How does your proposal meet the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to:

1. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
2. Advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups
3. Foster good relations between people from different groups

Include details in the space below

5. Outcome of the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) click the box that applies

Outcome 1

No change required: the EqIA has not identified any potential for unlawful conduct or disproportionate impact and all opportunities to advance equality of opportunity are being addressed

Outcome 2

Adjustments to remove/mitigate negative impacts identified by the assessment, or to better advance equality, as stated in section 3&4

Outcome 3

This EqIA has identified discrimination and/ or missed opportunities to advance equality and/or foster good relations. However, it is still reasonable to continue with the activity. Outline the reasons for this and the information used to reach this decision in the space below.

Include details here

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)



You will need to produce an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) if:

- You are developing a new policy, strategy, or service
- You are making changes that will affect front-line services
- You are reducing budgets, which may affect front-line services
- You are changing the way services are funded and this may impact the quality of the service and who can access it
- You are making a decision that could have a different impact on different groups of people
- You are making staff redundant or changing their roles

Guidance notes on how to complete an EqIA and sign off process are available on the Hub under Equality and Diversity. You must read the [guidance notes](#) and ensure you have followed all stages of the EqIA approval process (outlined in appendix 1). Section 2 of the template requires you to undertake an assessment of the impact of your proposals on groups with protected characteristics. Equalities and borough profile data, as well as other sources of statistical information can be found on the Harrow hub, within the section entitled: [Equality Impact Assessment](#) - sources of statistical information.

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)		
Type of Decision:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Cabinet <input type="radio"/> Portfolio holder <input type="radio"/> Other (state)	
Title of Proposal	Savings Proposals 21/22 COM_20.21_S05	Date EqIA created 2/2/21
Name and job title of completing/lead Officer	Paul Walker	
Directorate/ Service responsible	Community- Housing Services	
Organisational approval		
EqlA approved by Directorate Equalities Lead	Name Dave Corby Head of Service- Community Engagement Community- Commissioning Services	Signature <input type="checkbox"/> Tick this box to indicate that you have approved this EqIA Date of approval

1. Summary of proposal, impact on groups with protected characteristics and mitigating actions (to be completed after you have completed sections 2 - 5)	
	<p>a) What is your proposal?</p> <p>The proposal is to achieve budget savings in 2021/22 of £82,000 through service efficiencies, with minimal impact on services.</p> <p><u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u></p> <p>The housing-related floating support service is delivered by EACH Counselling & Support. The proposed saving of £38,000 to the General Fund has been achieved by substituting this with Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. There is no change in the service provided.</p> <p><u>Reduction in funding of Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>The support service for council tenants in sheltered housing for older people is an in-house service. The proposed saving of £30,000 to the General Fund has been achieved through management efficiencies. There is no change in the service provided to residents the deletion of the Support Coordinator Team Leader post.</p>
	<p>b) Summarise the impact of your proposal on groups with protected characteristics</p> <p><u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u></p> <p>The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.</p> <p><u>Reduction in funding of Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>The proposal will have no impact on service users as the savings have been made from management efficiencies and the service to residents will not change. The service is provided to tenants with support needs across 17 schemes. There are currently 574 sheltered tenants, including joint tenants, and around 150 receive support every year.</p>
	<p>c) Summarise any potential negative impact(s) identified and mitigating actions</p>

--

2. Assessing impact					
You are required to undertake a detailed analysis of the impact of your proposals on groups with protected characteristics. You should refer to borough profile data , equalities data , service user information, consultation responses and any other relevant data/evidence to help you assess and explain what impact (if any) your proposal(s) will have on each group. Where there are gaps in data, you should state this in the boxes below and what action (if any), you will take to address this in the future.		What does the evidence tell you about the impact your proposal may have on groups with protected characteristics? Click the relevant box to indicate whether your proposal will have a positive impact, negative (minor, major), or no impact			
Protected characteristic	For each protected characteristic, explain in detail what the evidence is suggesting and the impact of your proposal (if any). Click the appropriate box on the right to indicate the outcome of your analysis.	Positive impact	Negative impact		No impact
			Minor	Major	
Age	<u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u> The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u> As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. 96% of the tenants are aged 65 years or over, 3% are aged between 55 and 64 years and 1% are aged under 55 years. The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it. No impact is anticipated on this protected characteristic.				
Disability	<u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u> The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<p>the funding arrangements.</p> <p><u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. The data available shows that at least 33% of the tenants are disabled, have a long-term health condition or experience mental ill health. The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it. No impact is anticipated on this protected characteristic.</p>				
Gender reassignment	<p><u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u></p> <p>The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.</p> <p><u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. We do not have sufficient data on gender reassignment to assess the impact of the proposed change, but we do not anticipate that it will have a negative impact on this group. The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<p><u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u></p> <p>The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<p><u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. We do not have sufficient data on marriage and civil partnership to assess the impact of the proposed change, but we do not anticipate that it will have a negative impact on this group. The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it.</p>				
Pregnancy and Maternity	<p><u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u></p> <p>The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.</p> <p><u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. Due to the age of the client group it is unlikely that any sheltered housing tenants will identify with this protected characteristic and we do not anticipate that it will have a negative impact on this group. The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Race/ Ethnicity	<u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u>				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.							
	<u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u>							
	As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. 16% of tenants have not disclosed their ethnicity. Of those who did declare their ethnicity 50% are Asian, with the most common group being Indian.							
	Ethnicity	Number	% of total	% of those disclosed				
	White	146	26	30				
	Black	68	12	14				
	Asian	243	42	50				
	Mixed	8	1	2				
	Other	17	3	4				
Not disclosed	92	16	N/A					
Total	574	100	100					
The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it. No impact is anticipated on this protected characteristic.								

<p>Religion or belief</p>	<p><u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u></p> <p>The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.</p> <p><u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. Information about religion or belief is only available for 35% of the tenants. Of those for whom a religion is recorded 38% are Christian, 36% are Hindu, 11% are Muslim and 15% identify with other religions or prefer not to say. The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it. No impact is anticipated on this protected characteristic.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Sex</p>	<p><u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u></p> <p>The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.</p> <p><u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. There are 340 female tenants (59%) and 234 male tenants (41%). The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it. No impact is anticipated on this protected characteristic.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sexual Orientation	<p><u>Change in funding of Housing-Related Floating Support delivered by EACH Counselling & Support from April 2021</u></p> <p>The proposal will have no impact on service users as the service will not change, only the funding arrangements.</p>				
	<p><u>Reduction in Harrow Council Sheltered Housing for Older People Support Service from April 2021</u></p> <p>As at 28 January 2021 there are 574 council sheltered tenants, including joint tenants. We do not have sufficient data on sexual orientation to assess the impact of the proposed change, but we do not anticipate that it will have a negative impact on this protected characteristic. The support service will continue to be available to sheltered tenants who require it.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2.1 Cumulative impact – considering what else is happening within the Council and Harrow as a whole, could your proposals have a cumulative impact on groups with protected characteristics?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>					
<p>If you clicked the Yes box, which groups with protected characteristics could be affected and what is the potential impact? Include details in the space below</p>					
<p>2.2 Any other impact - considering what else is happening nationally/locally (national/local/regional policies, socio-economic factors etc), could your proposals have an impact on individuals/service users, or other groups?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes No <input type="checkbox"/></p>					
<p>If you clicked the Yes box, Include details in the space below</p>					

3. Actions to mitigate/remove negative impact

Only complete this section if your assessment (in section 2) suggests that your proposals may have a negative impact on groups with protected characteristics. If you have not identified any negative impacts, please complete sections 4 and 5.

In the table below, please state what these potential negative impact (s) are, mitigating actions and steps taken to ensure that these measures will address and remove any negative impacts identified and by when. Please also state how you will monitor the impact of your proposal once implemented.

State what the negative impact(s) are for each group, identified in section 2. In addition, you should also consider and state potential risks associated with your proposal.	Measures to mitigate negative impact (provide details, including details of and additional consultation undertaken/to be carried out in the future). If you are unable to identify measures to mitigate impact, please state so and provide a brief explanation.	What action (s) will you take to assess whether these measures have addressed and removed any negative impacts identified in your analysis? Please provide details. If you have previously stated that you are unable to identify measures to mitigate impact please state below.	Deadline date	Lead Officer
			?	?

4. Public Sector Equality Duty

How does your proposal meet the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to:

1. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
2. Advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups
3. Foster good relations between people from different groups

The provision of support services for people with support needs, in the community and in council sheltered housing, contributes to advancing equality of opportunity between people from different groups.

5. Outcome of the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) click the box that applies

Outcome 1

No change required: the EqIA has not identified any potential for unlawful conduct or disproportionate impact and all opportunities to advance equality of opportunity are being addressed

Outcome 2

Adjustments to remove/mitigate negative impacts identified by the assessment, or to better advance equality, as stated in section 3&4

Outcome 3

This EqIA has identified discrimination and/ or missed opportunities to advance equality and/or foster good relations. However, it is still reasonable to continue with the activity. Outline the reasons for this and the information used to reach this decision in the space below.

Include details here



Cabinet – 11 February 2021

Harrow Business Consultative Panel – 25 January 2021

Minute Item 22 – Draft Revenue Budget 2021/22 and Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 to 2023/24

Members received two reports of the Director of Finance which set out the Council's proposed Draft Revenue Budget 2021/22 and the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 to 2023/24.

The Chair welcomed Members and representatives of the business community to the virtual meeting. He explained that the Council had a statutory duty to consult the business community before setting the Budget and Council Tax for the forthcoming year.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

For Information.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 11 February 2021

Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 12 January 2021

148. Question and Answer Session with the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive

The Chair opened the Question and Answer session, explaining that it was part of the Council's general annual consultation process on the budget. He outlined the order of the session, stating that the Committee would first receive a Covid-19 update from the Chief Executive, before moving on to opening statements from the Director of Finance and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources. The Committee will then move on to a question and answer session, focusing on the following priority areas:

In his opening statement, the Chief Executive provided a brief update on the latest Covid-19 position, outlining a number of key points:

- Covid-19 cases remained very high across all London boroughs, including Harrow, although there was some early evidence that the national lockdown was starting to have an impact in slowing the rate of transmission.
- pressure on the NHS and hospitals was expected to remain significant for at least a fortnight, with Harrow's Northwick Park Hospital already at capacity with Covid-19 patients; however, significant amount of work and resources were being invested in supporting the situation.
- work around enforcement and ensuring public compliance with lockdown rules continued, with an overall good level of response and cooperation from Harrow residents and businesses observed.
- significant economic impact across the borough remained but the Council continued to work towards supporting local businesses through the provision of grants.
- good cooperation and response from schools. However, concerns over increased risk of transmission remained due to the higher number of schools were had remained open compared to previous lockdown.
- Council was investing in a number of key areas including:
 - lateral flow testing continued and extra funding from government had been extended until end of March 2021.
 - enforcement of rules and directing resources toward employment of Covid-19 marshals as well as ongoing communication and community engagement in order to break chain of infection.
 - vaccination programme – two primary care centres and one mass vaccination site (Byron Hall) had been set up. Social care

staff expected to be invited for vaccination in due course. A further mass vaccination site at Wembley was also going to open and would be available to Harrow residents. However, Council facing challenges around large scale availability of vaccines.

By way of conclusion, the Chief Executive acknowledged the challenge the pandemic had had on the council's workforce. He thanked all staff for continuing to work tirelessly throughout the pandemic and paid tribute to their ongoing dedication.

The Committee then heard a statement from the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources on the Council's budget for 2021/22. A number of key points were outlined:

- despite the challenges posed by the substantial financial loss and expenditure, the scale of uncertainty and pressure due to Covid-19 and the insufficient government funding which had led a significant budget gap, the Council had succeeded in producing a balanced budget for 2021/22, with no proposed front line service cuts;
- Government's spending review in November 2020 was changed from a 3 to 1-year period, which further underlined the level of financial uncertainty the Council was facing. This included several areas such as availability of funding, wider impact of Covid-19 on the Council's income and volatility due to fees and charges;
- following a recent government announcement on the adult social care precept, council tax across all of England had been levied at 5% on all council taxpayers.
- Majority of business grants were being paid out automatically or using discretion in an effort to support businesses, with the Council exploring further opportunities to support local residents and business.

Members thanked the Chief Executive and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources for their statements. In the session which followed, questions centred around several key areas as set out below.

Q1: What was the cost to the Council for dealing with Covid-19 and how much of that cost had been refunded by the government so far?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources explained that the estimated cost for dealing with Covid-19 was constantly changing. Acknowledging the significant gap between the total impact on income and costs and the amount of support received, he stated that some detail had already been provided through the Quarter 2 financial report, which was included in the published agenda pack for the meeting, with more up to date information expected over the coming weeks as part of the Quarter 3 report.

The Director of Finance added that a total of £18.1 million in general emergency funding and £4.3 million in compensation from income loss funding had been received from the government to date. The funding was

expected to increase and would be spent on essential services required for tackling the pandemic.

Q2: Taking into consideration that the total amount of direct government grant, not including business grants, is £27 million and the additional costs to the Council due to Covid-19 equate to £23 million, why is the Council still in a position where it claims that its costs had not been covered?

In response to the question, the Director of Finance stated that the amount of £27 million was money the Council had in grants. She continued by explaining that the government funding was split into two categories – general expenditure funding (including general emergency funding and compensation of loss) and a number of grants (e.g. business grants). Those grants were allocated for very specific areas of expenditure, which sat outside of the authority and did not replace money which had been lost in the budget for the year.

The total cost to the Council for dealing with the pandemic equated to £23 million, which did not include any new activities or projects the Council was currently undertaking. The information set out in Appendix 3 to the budget report showed the areas where the Council could spend money on and therefore put against the total budget. The money that the Council had spent so far and had an actual impact on its budget were covered in the emergency funding.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources added that the most recent update on the Council's costs was set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Update report, presented to Cabinet in October 2020, according to which the total financial impact prior to any government funding being received was £36 million. Subsequently the Council received £50 million in emergency funding and £4.7 million in compensation payments bringing the net impact of the pandemic to £60.7 million.

Noting the Member's concerns over tracking and understanding the exact impact of Covid-19 on the Council's budget gap, the Chair requested that officers undertake to prepare an analysis of an "alternative universe" including a comparison of what the Council would have spent in 2021 had it not been for Covid-19 versus what its current expenses were; what had the Council spent so far and the what proportion of that spending was from government funding and what from other areas; and impact of Covid-19 in current financial year versus total impact of Covid-19.

Q2 – With the Covid-19 crisis going on for over 10 months, what contingency plans does the Council have in place should the crisis continue?

The Chief Executive said that from a policy perspective it was difficult to know how the pandemic would unfold. The longer the crisis continued, the more resources would be required from the government to enable councils to respond adequately.

The Portfolio for Finance and Resources assured the Committee that Harrow Council was in a good position compared to other local authorities. However, he added that it was important to be prudent when setting the budget and focus on recovering some of the lost income as well as addressing the uncertainty over additional funding. He emphasised that the emergency reserves remained intact and the Council was determined to minimise use of any additional reserves.

Q3 – How do we know that key workers are genuinely “key”? What is the Council’s human resources “forward plan”?

The Chief Executive acknowledged the significant debate on the topic. In terms of support to schools and parents, who were key workers, latest government guidance included a clear definition on what constituted a “key worker” and was seen as a step forward. However, the guidance had also posed a further strain on schools particularly around requirements over online learning and schools were much busier now than during the previous national lockdown with key worker parents more likely to send their children to school. He added that even though children were less likely to contract the virus, they were still able to transmit it to older people. Overall public compliance with the lockdown rules was good and majority of the people were acting responsibly.

In terms of the human resources aspect, the Chief Executive stated that there was no large-scale funding reductions or job loss envisioned in the budget proposals, except for some budgets in the Community Directorate where council’s income projections did not match what had been delivered. As a result, there may be a need to change how some services were delivered and instigate a restructure, affecting only a small proportion of council staff, in order to better match income with expenditure budgets.

The Committee Member thanked the Chief Executive for his response and emphasised the importance of not losing sight of the human aspect/staffing issues.

The Committee also expressed their appreciation to the officers responsible for managing the business grants processes and acknowledged the improvement and positive feedback received.

Q4 – Comment on the importance of having consistency in figures and availability of the most up to date information for scrutiny.

The Director of Finance explained that some of the reserves mentioned in the report was money the Council had to have on its balance sheets but was not available for the Council to spend and therefore could not be considered as part of the general fund budget. Other general reserves were factored into the total figure which were available to use instead.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources noted that papers presented before the Committee were prepared back in October 2020 as part of the Council’s regular reporting schedule. More up to date figures would be produced in the next few weeks as part of the Quarter 3 monitoring and final budget reports.

In terms of reserves, he added that some came from specific areas (e.g. CIL fund) and other were built through surpluses (e.g budget planning reserve). He reminded the Committee that the Council had set balanced budget for the next financial year without the need for service cuts or using emergency funds and defended the approach.

The Chief Executive stated that in most councils, the biggest impact of Covid-19 had been on additional costs and having to operate with less funds due to loss of income. Although the government did provide the Council with some funds by way of compensation, the total amount of resources in income replacement and grants did not match the amount of additional expenditure/loss income the Council had received. Whilst more emergency funding was expected to be provided for the next financial year, it was unlikely to be sufficient to balance the budget, so it was important for the Council to be prepared and set aside as much reserves as possible.

Q5 – Can separate tables for each of the different reserves be prepared to give better reflection of the actual reserves the Council has?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources noted the suggestion but stated that the Council needed to be careful in how it categorized its reserves.

Q6 –Why did the Council decide to use reserves in order to deliver a balanced budget, what reserves is it going to use and how would that impact on the overall budget stability?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources explained that having to use reserves was not unique to this year's budget and whilst the preference remained to retain as much of the reserves as possible, the Council was comfortable with its decision to use them if necessary. He explained to the Committee that a structural problem in local government existed and assured Members that Harrow was not an outlier in trying to bridge budget gaps every year. A contributing factor in the budget gaps was also adult social care (ASC). Although the government had promised a plan to address issues with ASC funding, it remained to be delivered.

The Director of Finance added that a major challenge for the Council in setting the budget for 2021/22 was doing so before the indicative government settlement had been received. This meant that the Council was forced to set a budget before knowing what funds it was going to get for the following year. As a result of this uncertainty, a decision was made to put some reserves in the budget with the intention to use the minimum amount possible.

The Chief Executive also noted the issues of practicality and complexity of dealing with Covid -19, as a result of which it was unlikely for the Council to achieve any savings in its budget. Acknowledging the gravity of taking such decision, he explained that using reserves instead of taking the cost out of the Council was agreed because of the uncertainty around future government funding but also because of the pressures arising from dealing with the pandemic.

Q7 – How much of the income had been lost from parking and how much of that was down to on-street parking bays taken out of action, particularly due to schemes such as StreetSpace?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said that the StreetSpace scheme had had a minimum impact on parking income. Transport for London data showed significant reduction in number of journeys people made due to the pandemic, which resulted in limited use of council car parks and fewer penalty notices being issued.

Q8 – The Budget assumes a £2 million underspend for this financial year but the report refers to an overspend - can you give an confirm which is correct?

The Director of Finance confirmed that upcoming Quarter 3 figures were expected to report an achievable £2 million underspend in the Council's budget.

Q9 – The budget shortfall exceeds balance of remaining non-earmarked reserves – if this happens, is the Council effectively going to be bankrupt?

The Director of Finance acknowledged the challenges arising from the significant budget gap between guaranteed income and predicted expenditure coupled with the uncertainty over future funding but assured the Committee there was no risk in the Council going bankrupt. The Council was taking a proactive stance with the budget planning process playing a key role in managing potential shortfalls and plans were already being put in place in anticipation for the 2022/23 budget. If the gap exceeded the available reserves and action needed to be taken, the Council had several options at its disposal including an increase in Council Tax as well as taking a number of decisions on funding including Adult Social Care.

The Chief Executive said that the information set out in report was representative of what local authorities had been facing over the past decade. He noted that other factors such as change in political control and more recently Covid-19, could also have an impact on a council's budget. Current decision to use reserves was based on the assumption that more funding would be provided and that there would be an increase in income, but it was possible that further calibrations may need to be made later in the year. He assured the Committee that the Council was prepared to take difficult decisions in order to balance the budget if it thought that a bankruptcy situation could occur.

Q10 – What is the Council going to do about the budget shortfall and when, so it is not put in a position where it has to made drastic decisions?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources explained that the Council ended up in a similar position every year in order to achieve a balanced budget. The reason for this was prudent budgeting with projections of a slightly larger budget gap being made. He also acknowledged increasing

amount of revenue coming from the government and said that additional funding would be available. He said that it was too early to make any decisions on the budget gap. More detailed proposals were expected by the summer when the Council would have a better understand of the financial situation as well as a better indication of the government's policy agenda and be able to act accordingly.

Q11 – Does the Council have sufficient capacity to bring forward proposals in good time to carry out the required consultations? What discussions has the Council had with the trade unions and other partners to deal with the budget gap in the coming years?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources and Director of Finance acknowledged that capacity across the Council was strained and any consultations had to be targeted. He noted that some consultations were already ongoing and expressed willingness to involve trade unions and other partners on any future major changes as early as possible. The Council was in the process of planning how to address financial challenges including targeting extra capacity.

Q12 – A Committee Member sought clarification on the following issues: 1) new homes bonus reversal and putting money back into the budget; 2) how much of the £100m approved for the investment income programme had been borrowed; and 3) is Harrow in line to benefit from the projected reduction in public works loan interest rates?

With regards to the new homes' bonus, the Director of Finance said that the grant would not be phased out as previously advised but would continue in some form.

With regards to the £100 million investment income, the Committee was informed that it had been removed from the budget due to challenges around securing investments which meet the criteria. The amount of £100 million was not borrowed by the Council and only one property had been purchased so far.

In response to the query on Public Works loans, the Committee was informed that the Council had not borrowed any money over the last twelve months. However, when it received its financial forecast and was in a position to take on new borrowings, it would ensure that it makes best use of the lower rates.

Q13 – How does the budget gap compare to other London boroughs? What is the Council doing to prioritise the government fair funding review?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said that compared to other London boroughs Harrow sat on the lower end of the scale when it came to its reserves (circa £10m). However, its overall financial position was fairly strong not just because of its consistently prudent budgeting approach but also because it did not have to take large loans.

He noted the delays with regards to the Fair Funding Review and the London Council's concerns over its impact. He added that a balanced multi-year funding settlement was the most desirable outcome for all London boroughs but sub-division of the funds remained a major challenge as it depended not only on the total funds available but also on the specific needs of each borough. Harrow was closely engaged in the process and was in regular contact with London Councils and other London boroughs.

Q14 – Considering the size of the capital costs and the amount of spending on servicing the capital debt, what is the Council doing to bring down the level of debt in order to reduce its spending financing it?

In response, the Director of Finance said that the current Council's debt stood at £421 million. She assured the Committee that it was being managed carefully and the Council had not borrowed any money during the pandemic in order to keep capital financing costs down. Although the overall aim was to reduce the level of debt as much as possible, managing it was ultimately a balancing act between having sufficient funds for essential services provision but also keeping debt levels to a minimum through careful cash flow management.

Q15 – Can the Committee have an indication of how the Council's debt compares to other local authorities and when are the Council's projections for repaying it? Why 25% of the budget is going for re-servicing debt instead of providing services to residents?

The Director of Finance explained that it was common for local authorities to have a level of debt. In theory, for a Council to pay its debt off completely it would need to set a clear repayment strategy and make contributions over an agreed period of time. In reality, this was much more challenging, making it likely that a Council would retain a level of debt for the foreseeable future. Instead local authorities such as Harrow were focusing on maintaining an achievable level of debt that could be contained within the revenue account.

With regards to the amount of money going towards re-servicing the Council's debt, the Director of Finance stated that this was about £ 7 million and did not impact on the revenue accounts. She explained that the minimum revenue provision was an oddity in local government finance, with Councils required to set a notional amount within their budgets aside for loan repayment. Those funds were used to fund the debt, so the Council did not have to take up additional capital financing to fund that expenditure.

Q16 – What is the Council's position on the regeneration programme, how much of the original cost had been written off and what happens to that expenditure? Will there be any costs sharing and money coming back to Council?

The Director of Finance explained that the Council had been working on the abortive revenue costs from the old regeneration programme which were not relevant or viable within the new regeneration programme in order to ensure that the final level of write off was correct. Cost sharing on costs already

incurred was unlikely, with any money previously charged to capital being transferred to the Council's revenue account.

While no specifics could be given on the exact level of write off at this stage, the Director of Finance said that more details were expected to be included as part of the Council's Financial Outturn report in June 2021.

Q17 – Noting the issues that London Borough of Croydon had experienced in managing its the regeneration scheme, what is the Council doing to prevent the same problem happening in Harrow?

The Director of Finance explained that Harrow's situation was different from Croydon in that it did not have its own trading entity to which to lend a huge amount of money to. She assured Members that the only loan Harrow had was made to the LLP Consortium, which managed a housing property on behalf of the Council. The loan given was just over £1 million and had already been paid off in full.

Q18 – Is the Council still expecting a level of income from the Depot's redevelopment? Why hasn't that income been kept in the budget? The Council didn't obtain planning permission for commercial use of the Depot, so can it still receive an income from it?

The Director of Finance explained that when the draft budget for 2021/22 was set, the income from the original depot target of £631 million had been removed on account that some income had been achieved from the Depot. The amount of money remaining in the budget that related to the Depot was approximately half a million. She added that part of the Depot would continue to be operational building and as such would generate some income to the Council.

The Director of Finance acknowledged the planning permission issues from the letting of the Depot for commercial purposes but confirmed that it related specifically to the recent two storey extension of the Depot.

Q19 - Can you confirm that the regeneration project will not cause a strain on the Council's budget and what kind of contingencies are planned should anything go wrong? With Council Tax going up again, what reassurance can you give to residents that core services will not be adversely affected?

The Director for Finance explained that whilst there was no guarantee that no pressures will arise, the new regeneration project was set up very differently from the previous. Under the new programme, the Council had formed a development partnership and would be working alongside a preferred bidder (Wates), with a strong focus on cost neutrality for some of the elements of the regeneration programme.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources stated that despite the challenging circumstances complaints on the provision of services were low and the Council was committed to maintaining its core services to the highest possible standard.

Q20 – How would you justify the decision to move some of the helplines online and doesn't that discriminate against those people who are less technologically competent or have no access to the internet? What is the Council doing to ensure that no one falls through the net?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said the decision to move some services online had been largely welcomed. Significant energy and investment were being put into ensuring the Council was as easy as possible to transact with online (e.g launching a new more user friendly website) but also that the Digital Cohesion Strategy recognised the needs of those residents who couldn't use online services and offered sufficient alternative support through the use of libraries, one stop shop and advice services.

Q21 – Has any consideration been given to how Council Tax would be collected in a different environment, one which reflects rising levels of unemployment?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources acknowledged the impact of unemployment on council tax collection and the significant number of people who were now in receipt of council tax support. However, he reminded the Committee that since April 2020 the Council had taken a proactive stance and had been encouraging residents to pay their council tax, fully or partially or get in touch with the Council if requiring help. As a result, the overall council tax collection rate in Harrow was relatively good, with a number of residents benefiting from a discount.

He assured the Committee that the Council was committed to supporting council tax recipients and avoid the use of bailiffs whenever possible. A local strategy focusing on local investment and council tax recipients was being developed with more details to be provided over the coming months. A further positive development had also been the recent government increase in Universal Credit allowance which had been a lifeline for many people and the Council was determined to ensure the support was extended beyond end of March 2021.

Q22 – What does the Council do to steer people towards debt management where required?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said that people who needed help were signposted to specialist local charities. Residents struggling with council tax payments were also being encouraged to contact the Council and arrange a personalised payment plan that best suited their circumstances.

Q23 – Does the Council Tax figure in the budget report include precepts expected from the Greater London Authority (GLA)? Does the furlough scheme affect council tax collection?

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said that GLA precepts were not included in the budget.

In terms of the impact of the furlough scheme, he stated that the scheme had made a significant difference to a number of groups, particularly to those who had experienced biggest changes in their financial circumstances.

Q24 – A Committee Member expressed their concerns about the health of residents and suggested that it be prioritised as part of the Council’s overall health strategy across the borough.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources noted the Member’s comments.

At the end of the question session the Chair thanked the Chief Executive, Director of Finance and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources for their attendance and responses. On behalf of the Committee, the Chair also expressed his gratitude to all council staff for their hard work throughout the pandemic.

RESOLVED: That the reports and responses received on the Council budget during the Question and Answer session, be noted.

For Information.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 11 February 2021

Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee – 14 December 2020

Minute Item 61 – Reports from the Director of Finance

Members received three reports from the Director of Finance. These were:

- 1) Revenue and Capital Monitoring 2020/21 - as at Quarter 2 (30 September 2020);
- 2) Draft Revenue Budget 2021/2022 and Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/2022 to 2023/2024; and
- 3) Draft Capital Programme 2020/2021 to 2023/2024.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

For Information.

This page is intentionally left blank

Employees' Consultative Forum

Minutes

25 January 2021

Present:

Chair: Mr D Searles

Councillors: Camilla Bath
Pamela Fitzpatrick
John Hinkley
Angella Murphy-Strachan
Mina Parmar
Varsha Parmar
Adam Swersky

**Teacher
Representatives:** Ms L Crimmins - NEU
Ms A Lyons - NAHT

**Unison
Representatives:** Mr J Royle

**GMB
Representative:** Ms P Belgrave

**Apologies
received:** Ann Jones GMB

Absent: Gary Martin

In attendance: Mr J Nobelmann Regional Organiser, Unison

Resolved Items

59. **Draft Revenue Budget 2021/22 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22-2023/24**

The Forum received a report of the Director of Finance which set out the draft revenue budget for 2021/22 and draft Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2021/22 to 2023/24. The budget and MTFS would be submitted to Cabinet in February 2021 for final approval and recommendation to Council.

The Director of Finance introduced the budget report and explained that it had been challenging to produce due to uncertainties and as the Council had only received a one year, rather than three year, settlement. The draft budget had been prepared prior to the Council receiving its indicative settlement from the government. The report also advised the Forum that there was a proposed increase in Council Tax of 4.99% and the Director explained that Reserves of £6 million had been used to 'plug' the budget gap. She reassured Members that this figure would reduce to approximately £1 million when the final budget was reported to Cabinet in February 2021.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Finance confirmed that 3% of the 4.99% increase in Council Tax was the Adult Social Care precept and that the Adults directorate was forecasting £6.3 million of pressures in 2021/22. In terms of the remaining 1.99%, the Director advised that the largest areas of growth were in Children Services placement costs and in the Community Directorate in terms of waste services. She advised that the underspend on the costs of Freedom Passes could be transferred into front line services for growth. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources added that there were some priority areas, a whole programme of transformation as well as a focus on equalities work and the London Living Wage.

A Member questioned whether there was any likelihood that the Council would be considering cuts in services and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources confirmed that there were no proposed cuts to front line services in the budget. He added that the Council was awaiting financial certainty for the future and that if the position remained the same at the end of the next financial year some cuts were to be expected as there was a limit to what services the Council could offer within the financial constraints it was under. The Council did not want to be in the position of serving a Section 114 notice.

A representative of Unison stated that he wished to repeat the question that he asked last year in that there was a rumour circulating at the Depot site that the Administration was considering outsourcing some services, including waste and gardening. The Portfolio Holder advised that the Council was investing in the Depot site and that he was keen to insource services where possible and wished to strengthen internal teams but added that some services would always be contracted out. He confirmed that there had been no discussion in terms of outsourcing waste and gardening services and this was endorsed by the Corporate Director of Community. The Corporate Director added that the Corporate Strategic Board were immensely proud of

the work being undertaken by Depot staff, particularly during the ongoing pandemic, and was committed to strengthening the in-house service. He offered to discuss this issue with any members of staff that had concerns.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the comments made by the Forum be referred to Cabinet for consideration.

This page is intentionally left blank