

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

Directorate	Type	Number
ACS	DPO	605

Live/Active
1

Project	Review of the In House Adult Disability Provider Domiciliary Service
Sponsor	M Lawrenson - Head of In House Provider Service
Objective	The project will concentrate on reducing the size of the In House Countywide Domiciliary Service which currently supports 320 service users in 112 houses. The project will review the existing supported living arrangements within the in house Domiciliary Service and make proposals to reduce the size of the service, over the next four years by exploring more cost effective supported living arrangements for some tenants
Staff Input Involved	A Project Team will need to be established drawn from staff within the Service and also containing staff from other areas of PSC, Commissioning, Finance, HR and Communications

Scope

All 320 tenants will be reviewed and all 10 Domiciliary Schemes within the in house service will be within the scope of this project.

Expected Outcomes

Fewer tenants will be in receipt of in house support generating savings for the council.

What Will Be Different?

END TARGET by 2017-18 – to have reduced the size of the in house domiciliary service by around two thirds (i.e. from 320 tenants down to around 120 or below) and that the remaining tenants are those with higher level support needs, thus generating savings of a prudent estimate of approximately £4.2m by reducing the size of the workforce and securing more cost effective support arrangements for approximately 200 tenants

What Savings can be achieved?

By the end of project it is expected that approximately £4.2m of savings will be achieved by reducing the size of the workforce and securing more cost effective arrangements for approximately 200 tenants.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?

Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

Area	Description	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Total
In-House Service	Transfer tenants to external	---	---	0.360	0.730	0.370	1.460
Reconfigured Tenancies	0	---	---	---	1.410	1.410	2.820
0	0	---	---	---	---	---	---
0	0	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total net incremental savings		---	---	0.360	2.140	1.780	4.280

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

Directorate	Type	Number
ENV	DPO	803

Live/Active

1

Project	Lancashire Permit Scheme
Sponsor	Ray Worthington
Objective	Introduce a Permit Scheme for road and street works in Lancashire.
Staff Input Involved	Asset group staff will develop the proposal with support from a consultant with experience in other authorities successful permit schemes.

Scope

Works on the highway network cause disruption, delays and potential risks both to highway users and the highway asset. The majority of these works are undertaken by the utility companies and the Highway Authority. To try and reduce the impact these works have on road users, business and the local/national economy the Government introduced the Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004. The aim of the TMA is to encourage highway authorities and utility companies to put greater emphasis on co-ordination of works, including the authority's own works, with a view to minimise disruption and protect the highway infrastructure. One of the key mechanisms provided within the TMA is to allow highway authorities to introduce a Permit Scheme for authorising and controlling utility and highway works.

Currently utility companies working on the highway network are legally required by the New Roads & Street Works Act 1991 to serve notice on the Highway Authority before starting works. The NRSWA defines amongst many other things the notification process, timescales and actions required by the utility companies and the highway authority. The Highway Authority is not legally obliged but highly recommended to serve the same notices for its own works.

A Permit Scheme would replace the current noticing arrangements. This would give LCC much greater control over the works undertaken by the utility companies especially in regards to the timing of works, the type of traffic management used and how these works are carried out. It would also be mandatory for LCC's own works and those generated by other 3rd parties such as Developers and District Authorities.

Expected Outcomes

A permit scheme should reduce delays to road users caused by road and street works and minimise the impact these works have on local businesses, residents and bus passengers. This would be achieved by a reduction in the number of works, minimising road space occupied, reducing duration by encouraging better work planning and better communication of works. A permit scheme will allow the authority to scrutinise the work of the utility companies much more than under the current noticing regime. This will enable officers to challenge the 'how and when' aspects of the works and give the authority more control over what is happening on its highway network.

What Will Be Different?

The fundamental difference between notices and permits are:-

- Under the current noticing regime the utility companies tell us when, how and why they are working on the highway free of charge
- Under a permit scheme they have to ask us before working and we can apply conditions to the when and how elements of the works and charge them for each permit application.
- Anyone carrying out road and street works will need to apply for a Permit in advance of works (excluding emergencies). This includes works undertaken by and on behalf of Lancashire County Council. The application timescales will vary dependent on the type of work and the type of road.
- A fee is payable for each permit application and each amendment. The fee would not be payable for the authority's own works. The fee would vary dependent on the level of scrutiny required. For example small scale works on a quiet residential road may require less checking than large scale works on busy roads or routes.
- A permit scheme will allow us to set conditions on each permit with the aim of minimising disruption and protecting the highway asset. For example we would have more control over the timing and duration of works, the way in which they are undertaken and greater opportunity to publicise works. We could also specify the amount of road space to be left available to road users and pedestrians therefore keeping works much more compact.
- A permit scheme carries with it much bigger penalties for non-compliance than the current noticing regime. For example working without a permit carries a maximum fine of £5,000 (£2,500 under a noticing regime); and a £2,500 fine for not complying with a condition (not applicable under a noticing regime). All of these offences can be dealt with by Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) as under the current noticing regime but carry a significantly higher charge. For example an FPN for working without a permit would cost the utility company £300 (currently it is £120); not complying with a permit condition would be a £120 FPN. The FPN charges are paid directly to the authority and used for the administration of the process.

What Savings can be achieved?

The estimated permit fee income for Lancashire based on current levels of utility works and permits required for all activities on all streets is estimated at £1.2 million per year. This income will be used to fund 19 staff at DfT approved overhead rates. It is anticipated that 5 staff currently employed with asset group will transfer to jobs in the permit scheme. If staff are transferred from other areas of work within the directorate this will enable savings to be realised across the directorate. A more accurate breakdown of all associated costs, income and subsequent permit fees will be produced as part of the detailed preparation of the permit scheme and the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA). The estimated net income from the introduction of a permit scheme is £780,000. The income in year one will be reduced as the full year is unlikely to be achieved.

The cost of operating a Permit Scheme is borne by the utility companies. This is the additional costs of staffing, IT and other resources over and above the current costs of operating under the current Noticing Regime. As part of the permit scheme a fee matrix will be produced and this will give the charges for each permit application. The fee covers the costs and overheads of setting up and administering the permit scheme. The cost of preparing a permit scheme cannot be passed on to the utility companies.

Adjustments to the permit fees may be made in subsequent years to offset any surplus or deficit. It is not intended that permit schemes should produce surplus revenue, taking one year with another.

It is proposed to implement this proposal from 1st February 2015. This deadline is extremely tight and to achieve any savings in 2014/15 some investment in staff and specialist advice of £100,000 will be necessary.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

Yes

Amount of funding required?

0.100

What is the funding required for?

Data gathering resource and specialist advisers

Public Sector Equality Duty	
Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e	No
If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available	0

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)							
Area	Description	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Total
Highway Network	Works Permit	---	0.200	0.380	---	---	0.580
0	0	---	---	---	---	---	---
0	0	---	---	---	---	---	---
0	0	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total net incremental savings		---	0.200	0.380	---	---	0.580

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

Directorate	Type	Number
ENV	DPO	825

Live/Active

1

Project	Waste - Third party recycling credits
Sponsor	Steve Scott
Objective	To achieve a saving by withdrawing discretionary recycling credit payments to third sector organisations.
Staff Input Involved	Waste Management Group Corporate Communications

Scope

To implement the policy of not paying discretionary recycling credits to third sector and charitable organisations. These organisations will still be able to receive financial benefit through the sale of any recycled waste they collect but would not in future receive the added financial income through recycling credits paid by the County Council.

Expected Outcomes

Reduction in the Waste budget

What Will Be Different?

The payment of recycling credits to organisations will cease from 1st April 2014.

The County Council have historically paid 'Third Party Recycling Credits' to third sector groups and community organisations. The rate of payment in 2013/14 is £51.18 per tonne and increases annually by 3%.

The principle of Third Party Recycling Credits is that by collection of materials that may otherwise end up in the residual waste stream the third parties are saving the Council disposal costs. However, the recycling credits were introduced at a time when there was only limited collection at doorstep and at that time the third parties were actively assisting the Council in recycling.

Over the last 10 years the County Council has supported Waste Collection Authorities (WCAs) financially in order that they could implement robust systems for collecting recyclables separated by the householder. Furthermore, the Council has invested heavily into facilities for processing the recyclable materials collected.

As such, the original principle of paying Third Party Recycling Credits is no longer valid as waste collected by third parties would now otherwise be collected by the WCAs. In addition, the income from the materials collected by third parties would otherwise be received by the County Council. Whilst recognising the social benefits that the third parties provide in conducting recycling activities the County Council is financially supporting the WCAs to collect the same waste, paying the third parties recycling credits when they collect it instead and losing income on the materials that they collect (it should be noted that it is not the intent to increase income to the Authority as a result of the policy but it is the case that if it were not collected by the third parties the Council would receive income).

The most significant example of this is textiles. The WCAs are required to collect textiles as part of cost sharing arrangements and the County Council funds the WCAs to collect this waste. In 2012/13 textiles made up almost 70% of all Third Party Recycling Credit claims. The current market value of textiles is anywhere between £230 and £730 per tonne depending on the quality of the material.

The organisations affected by the proposed policy are as followed (the figure in brackets shows the amount paid to these groups in 2012/13);

5 x Uniformed Groups (£5,636)
24 x Charity Shops (£66,056)
25 x Schools (£7,272)

1 x Club (£149)
 11 x Churches (£7,382)
 2 x Charity Bring Banks (£9,270)
 8 x Community Groups (£6,277)
 5 x Hospices (£14,903)
 5 x Reuse Groups (£9,574)

The amounts paid by material in 2012/13 were;

Paper - £24,018
 Textiles - £85,238
 Shoes - £2,599
 Books - £8,147
 Plastics - £453
 Card - £642
 Glass - £1,136
 Mixed Recyclables - £4,144
 Composting - £141

The third parties will receive income from the recyclable materials that they collect. It is not anticipated that the majority would stop collecting the recyclables they currently do. In the case of textiles in particular the income received from the value of the textiles would be sufficient to support their continued collection.

What Savings can be achieved?

The anticipated cost in 2014/15 is £134,237 although the actual payments will be wholly dependant on tonnages collected.

Due to the uncertain nature of the amounts claimed the waste budget contains a contingency to allow for variations. In essence therefore the saving is the full amount allowed for in the waste budget which in 2014/15 is £280,000.

Staff time involved is minimal and as such there are no tangible savings in staffing.

Whilst there is the potential for additional income from recyclables collected at the doorstep it is not anticipated that the third sector collections would cease as a result of the policy and therefore this is likely to be negligible.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?	No	
Amount of funding required?	---	
What is the funding required for?		---

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e	Yes
If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available	Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

Area	Description	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Total
Waste	Recycling Credits	---	0.280	---	---	---	0.280
	0	0	---	---	---	---	---
	0	0	---	---	---	---	---
	0	0	---	---	---	---	---
Total net incremental savings		---	0.280	---	---	---	0.280



Equality Analysis Toolkit

605 - In House Domiciliary Services
For Decision Making Items

Name/Nature of the Decision

In House Domiciliary Services Review

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

In House Savings – Domiciliary Services (Supported Accommodation)

The project will concentrate on reducing the size of the In House Countywide Domiciliary Service which currently supports 320 service users in 112 houses. The project will review the existing supported living arrangements within the in house Domiciliary Service and make proposals to reduce the size of the service, over the next four years by exploring the availability of more cost effective supported living arrangements for some tenants

Following the completion of the review, the service may reduce in size over the next 4 years by approximately 2/3rds (from 320 tenants to around 120).

Savings will be generated for the Council as a result of the service reduction in the region of £4.280 million

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

People with learning disabilities who may also have some physical disabilities.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

People with a learning disability living in shared supported tenancies throughout the

whole of Lancashire.

Lancashire county Council supports over 3200 adults with a learning disability including around 360 people who live in residential or nursing care. Over 2700 people are helped to live at home with over 1800 of those living in supported living within Lancashire. There are 794 individual or shared living schemes. 591 of these that have some form of night time support.

No one is supported in a house with more than 6 tenants sharing and the most frequent size of tenancies is three and four person schemes.

Approximately 25 % of those people in supported living fall into the age band of 45-54 with the next highest (Approx 20%) falling into the 34-44 age group. Both the 25-54 and 55-54 age groups have approximately 18% each of the population living in supported living.

Approximately 11% of the population in supported living are over the age of 65.

Approximately 2.5% of Supported Living tenants are of BME origin.

There are as twice as many men in supported living than women.

The current level of vacancies at June 2012 was 125 accounting for about 7% of the overall capacity.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

The scope, actions, targets & outcomes of the project have yet to be determined however consultation with service users, their families, other providers and internal colleagues e.g Commissionign, PSC & Contracts, will be undertaken within an appropriate timescale to ensure that feedback will influence the direction of the project as necessary.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Further consideration of the potential impact will be assessed and added to this document later.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

The Remodelling of Learning Disability Support Accommodation within the independent sector is running in parallel and the number of providers may reduce as a result of this programme, leading to a reduced choice to those service users seeking alternative provision

The programme of activity to be undertaken by thte Remodelling Team is not intended to heighten disadvantages amongst any of the above groups and have used the following reference in support of this aim.

Commissioning Intention 5 states that we will 'Work with District Councils and housing partners to develop alternative types of accommodation which provide choice, enables people to retain their independence and whenever possible provides a home for life'.

Included in the actions to achieve this are :

To ensure that those people with learning disabilities who live in supported living schemes are supported in the most appropriate, flexible and cost effective way based on the principles of self directed support, maximising the use of personal budgets and universal services.

To remodel current supported living situations for people with learning disabilities to ensure that there will be a range of housing options available for people to choose from.

The Remodelling activity was commenced to support;

1. The County Council's response to Personalisation, now identified within future legislation - Care and Support Bill.
2. The development of self directed supports in Lancashire
3. Citizens living in existing supported living fully understand the impact of self directed supports and what their choices and options may be.
4. Achieve a range of affordable housing and support options that maintain the integrity of self directed supports.

The remodelling activity will aim to improve life opportunities and maintain a range of affordable models of support and the review of the in house Supported Living provision will reflect these intentions.

The Remodelling Team have however noted that there are risks within the existing model of supported living that impact on choice, particularly in relation to vacancies and voids.

The planned activity however will aim to address these risks and seek to minimise the impact of the model on choice and control, thus reducing the impact of any perceived inequality.

Consideration will also need to be given to any changes to housing benefit and how this may influence the way vacancies will be looked at by district councils.

Other proposals which will impact on this proposal include the review of Supporting People, Telecare and the integration of health & social care

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Continuing with the Original Proposal as this will identify any issues which arise as a result of the review, these will then be considered.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

1. Families and individual tenants who have been in receipt of support from the in house ADS Domiciliary Service (for over 20 years in some cases, when they were resettlement from the long stay hospitals) may not wish to move their support over to an external provider. Removing their choice to stay with the in house provider may prove problematic for some families.
2. The savings can only be made following the successful re-tendering of identified tenancies, which is dependent upon external providers being willing and able to deliver the required support within the level of the individual budgets of the tenants.

The above factors identified in 1. will be addressed in each tenancy with tenants and their relatives during the review process when their choices regarding future care and support will be discussed in detail. In regards to 2. detailed discussions will take place with all potential providers facilitated by LCC Commissioners and Contracts

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will

be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The context of this project is that it will run in parallel to the Supported Accommodation Review led by Commissioners and PSC, the Review of the LD Provider Framework and the work to generate FACE assessments of all 320 individual tenants, under the direction of PSC. This project will be very complicated as it will impact on 320 tenants, their families and approximately 820 overall staff within the current provider service, as well as several Housing Associations.

The level of financial savings required by the Council means that consideration must be given to reducing in house supports for people with more moderate needs, especially as there are other external providers who can offer a similar quality service at a more competitive rate. It is essential that this review of in house Supported Living is undertaken in parallel with a similar review of external provision under the 'Remodelling of Supported Accommodation Proposal', as there will be common issues raised within both projects which need to be considered together in order to develop a cohesive overall strategy for the future of all people with learning disabilities who live in supported accommodation across Lancashire.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

To continue to review the needs of all 320 tenants within the in house Domiciliary Service in order to determine their social care needs and the level of individual budget to be made available to meet these needs. This will then lead to a review of the current supported living arrangements and whether the tenants can be supported by other providers who can offer a good quality service at a more competitive rate

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Project Board
 Customer Feedback
 Person Centred Reviews
 Feedback from:
 PSC Review Team
 Commissioners

Contracts

External Providers

LCC Shared Lives Service



Equality Analysis Toolkit

825 - Third Party Recycling Credits

www.lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

To withdraw the payment of discretionary third party recycling credits.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Recycling credits are an optional payment (a discretionary power under the Environmental Protection Act 1990) made to community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups. Before the introduction of cost sharing, third party recycling made a positive contribution towards the removal of recyclable materials from landfill, saving the county council disposal costs.

The payment of recycling credits began in 1992, prior to the widespread kerbside recycling collections that are now in place across the County. The introduction of the cost sharing agreements between the County Council and Lancashire's District Waste Collection Authorities has resulted in 98.24% of households receiving a fortnightly kerbside collection of recyclables. Waste collection authorities who are part of the cost sharing agreement receive a payment per property to deliver services in this way. As part of the cost sharing policy the County Council receives income from the recyclables collected which, in some part, offsets these payments.

The success of kerbside recycling collections is such that the original principal upon which recycling credit payments were introduced is no longer valid. It is highly likely that the majority of the materials for which credits are paid would now be captured by District Council waste collections should third party recycling collections of these materials cease. As such, the County Council is effectively paying third parties to collect material for which alternatively would be collected by district waste collection authorities and which we would also receive an income.

It is not suggested that the organisations to which recycling credits are paid do not provide a valuable service to the community or assist recycling efforts. It is more that the County Council is essentially paying twice for the same service. Similarly, whilst the possibility has been considered (for the purpose of providing a complete picture), it is not anticipated that the withdrawal of recycling credits would prevent groups from continuing to collect these materials. The withdrawal of the credits would reduce some of the income they receive, but groups will still retain any additional income from the sale of collected material for recycling via recycling merchants.

Recycling levels may be affected although the impacts on Lancashire's overall waste diverted from landfill will be negligible.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g.

greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

Various groups will be affected ranging from large national charities to small charitable community groups and schemes across the County.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

The proposal will affect all community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups who claim recycling credits, and therefore it is likely that these groups will have members that share protected characteristics namely: people of different ages, people with a disability, people of different races/ethnicities/nationalities and people of different religions/beliefs.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

In 2012/13 there were 110 community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups registered to claim recycling credits. The following table illustrates who these groups are, what quantity of materials they collected for recycling in 2012/13, and how much money was received by each group as a result of the County Council paying a recycling credit, which in 2012/13 was paid at the rate of £49.69 per tonne of material recycled.

	Material Collected	Tonnage (Annual 2012/13)	Value of Credit Paid (£49.69/Tonne in 2012/13)
Uniformed Groups (5) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £5,636.33			
1st Church Boys Brigade	Paper	9.86	£489.94
1st Halton Scout group	Paper	22.24	£1,105.11
1st Upholland	Paper	2.93	£145.59
9th Penwortham	Paper, Textiles	21.98	£1,092.19
Chorley Healey Scouts	Paper, Textiles	56.42	£2,803.50
Charity Shops (28) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £66,112.07			
ADHD North West	-	0	0

Age Concern	Textiles, Books, Shoes, Mixed Recyclables	76.22	£3,787.37
Age UK	Textiles, Books, Shoes, Card, Mixed Recyclables, Mixed Metals	294.43	£14,630.23
Age UK Lancashire	Textiles, Books	44.07	£2,189.84
Barnados	-	0	0
British Heart Foundation	Textiles, Shoes	378.75	£18,820.09
British Red Cross	-	0	0
Cancer Help	Textiles, Books, Shoes	18.65	£926.72
Cancer Research	Textiles, Books, Shoes, Mixed	102.55	£5,095.71
Caritas Care	Textiles	4.94	£245.47
Debra	Textiles	1.65	£81.99
Marie Curie	Textiles	19.86	£986.84
National Blind Childrens Society	-	0	0
North West Air Ambulance	Textiles	11.27	£560.01
Oxfam	Textiles	139.29	£6,921.32
PDSA	Textiles	0.74	£36.77
Rosendale Hospice Shop	Textiles	4.48	£222.61
RSPCA Lancashire East	Textiles, Books, Shoes	11.16	£554.54
Rwanda groups trust	Textiles	5.45	£270.81
Samaritans	Textiles, Books, Shoes	3.86	£191.80
Save the Children	Textiles, Books	20.72	£1,029.58
Scope	Textiles	20.56	£1,021.63
Sense Trading	Textiles, Shoes	17.03	£846.22
Shaw Trust	Textiles, Books, Shoes	1.27	£63.11
Shelter	Textiles, Mixed Recyclables	10.59	£526.22
St Johns Hospice shops	Textiles, Books	80.91	£4,020.42
Sue Ryder	Textiles, Shoes	44.98	£2,235.06
Extracare Charitable Trust	Textiles, Books, Shoes	17.06	£847.71

Schools (31) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £7,272.15			
Alston Lane Catholic Primary	Paper	10.65	£529.20
Altham St James CE Primary	Paper	2.5	£124.23
Bowland High	Paper	4.17	£207.20
Bolton by Bowland Primary	Paper	1.53	£76.03
Brabins Endowed	Paper, Textiles	3.91	£194.29
Carnforth High	-	0	0
Cottam Primary	Paper, Textiles	1.29	£64.10
Dolphinholme Primary	Paper, Textiles	5.01	£248.95
Focus School - Hornby campus	Paper	6.56	£325.97
Forton Primary	Paper	1.8	£89.44
Fleetwood High School	Textiles, Books, Shoes	3.66	£181.87
Friends of Claughton School	Paper	15.02	£746.34
Friends of Scorton School	Paper, Textiles	1.02	£50.68
Nether Kellet Primary	-	0	0
Our Lady of Lourdes	Paper, Textiles	3.42	£169.94
Sandylands CP	Paper	15.56	£773.18
Silverdale St Johns CE School	Paper, Textiles	1.52	£75.53
St Bede's school	Paper	3.33	£165.47
St Bernards Catholic Primary	Paper	1.58	£78.51
St Josephs Catholic primary	-	0	0
Scotforth St Pauls CE	-	0	0
St Pauls	-	0	0
St Mary RC Primary	Paper, Textiles, Card	6.47	£321.50
St Therasas Upholland J+P	Paper	13.04	£647.96
St Wilfrids C of E School	Paper	11.18	£555.53
St Leonards School, Whalley	Paper	16.66	£827.84
St Nicholas CE Primary	Paper	2.51	£124.72
Thorneyholme RC Primary	Paper	0.74	£36.77
Westbourne House Day Nursery	-	0	0
Whalley CE Primary	Paper	10.22	£507.83
Willows Catholic Primary	Paper	3	£149.07
Clubs (1) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £149.07			
Appley Bridge FC	Paper	3	£149.07
Churches (12) – TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £7,382.95			
Bacup F'ship of Churches	Textiles, Shoes	6.46	£321
Edenfield Methodist	Paper	14.1	£700.63
Mellor Parish Church	Mixed Recyclables	3.04	£151.06

Shawforth Methodist	Paper	42.46	£2,109.84
St John the Evangelist	Paper	11.81	£586.84
St Johns - Hurst Green	Paper	5.54	£275.28
St Lukes - Brierfield	Paper	15.98	£794.05
St Mary Magdalen's Church	Paper	1.44	£71.55
St Marys RC	Paper	25.46	£1,265.11
St Marys Church Leyland	-	0	0
St Thomas Parish - Garstang	Paper	11.46	£569.45
St Thersas Church	Paper	10.83	£538.14
Bring Banks (2) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £8,831.40			
Clothes Aid -Great Ormond Street Hospital	Textiles	177.73	£8,831.40
Traid	Textiles	8.84	£439.26
Environmental Groups (1) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £0			
Wildlife Trust - Penwortham	-	0	0
Community Groups (12) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £6,277.35			
Brothers of Charity	Paper	41.27	£2,050.71
Crag Bank Village Hall	Paper	7.64	£379.63
Crossways Comm. Centre	-	0	0
Dolphinholme Village Hall	Paper	9.1	£452.18
Funds for you	Textiles	16.98	£843.74
Grindleton Womens Institute	-	0	0
Longridge bottle bank appeal	Glass	15.98	£794.05
Marsh Community Centre	Paper, Glass	9.46	£470.07
Phil the Box	-	0	0
Piccadily Garden	-	0	0
Rimington Womens Institute	Paper	4.16	£206.71
Villages in Partnership	Textiles	21.74	£1,080.26
Hospices (5) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £14,934.32			
East Lancashire Hospice	Textiles, Books, Shoes, Mixed Recyclables	18.05	£896.90
Hospice Care for Burnley/Pendle	Textiles, Books, Shoes	95.34	£4,737.44
Queenscourt Hospice	Textiles, Shoes	23.02	£1,143.86
Springhill Hopsice	Textiles, Shoes	9.64	£479.01
St Catherines Hospice	Paper, Textiles, Books, Shoes	154.53	£7,678.60
Reuse Groups (13) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £27,602.35			
Furniture Matters	Composting, Wood, Metals	120.59	£5,992.61
Gift 92	Metals	8.19	£496.96

Help the Homeless	Paper, Textiles, Metals	1.19	£59.13
Helping Hand	-	0	0
Homeless Action CiC	-	0	0
HUFS	Textiles, Card, Metals, Wood	225.13	£11,185.22
Integrate	Textiles, Books, Shoes	7.31	£363.23
International Aid	Paper, Textiles, Books, Shoes, Plastics, Paint, Metals, Wood	190.60	£9,470.91
Open Door	-	0	0
Recycling Lives	-	0	0
Refurb	Paint	0.69	£34.29
Tawd Vale Lions	-	0	0
West Lancs Community Recycling	-	0	0

As the proposal will affect all community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups who are registered to claim recycling credits, it is likely that these groups could have members that share protected characteristics.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision?
Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Any potential decision will be subject to consultation.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Recycling credits are an optional payment (a discretionary power under the Environmental Protection Act 1990) made to community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups. It is not anticipated that the withdrawal of recycling credits would prevent or discriminate against groups from continuing to collect materials for recycling. The proposal would reduce the funding groups receive from recycling credits, but these groups will still retain some income from the sale of collected material for recycling via recycling merchants.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Should other decisions within the County Council result in the withdrawal or reduction of income or funding to community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups the groups, the decision to stop paying third party discretionary recycling credits could have a cumulative effect. The effect would involve a reduction in income received by such groups if the groups are also involved in recycling activities.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

The original proposal remains unchanged. Due to the introduction of cost sharing, the District Councils in Lancashire receive funds from the County Council to collect the majority of recycled materials that third parties are collecting and claiming recycling credits for, so in effect if the current proposal was rejected the County Council would be double funding the collection of some materials for recycling.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

In September 2011 [Best Value statutory guidance](#) was published by the Communities and Local Government department. The guidance stated that local authorities should avoid making "disproportionate" funding cuts to the voluntary sector (disproportionate in relation to the county councils overall budget cuts).

The report states that Under the Duty of Best Value, authorities should consider overall value, including economic, environmental and social value, when reviewing

service provision" and that "Authorities should be responsive to the benefits and needs of voluntary and community sector organisations of all sizes.

The report also states that where an authority is seeking to reduce or end funding to community and voluntary groups, that these groups shall be given three months notice prior to the cuts, and that the authority actively engages with the groups as early as possible.

We will provide affected groups with due notice of the withdrawal of third party recycling credits to enable them to adjust their anticipated income streams.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

In Lancashire recycling credit payments to third parties were introduced in 1992 following the introduction of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Act introduced a mechanism for the discretionary payment of recycling credits to organisations that collect and retain household waste material for recycling rather than it being sent for disposal. The value of a third party recycling credit is based on waste disposal savings made by the County Council as the County Waste Disposal Authority and is equal to a monetary saving in landfill costs per tonne.

Currently in 2013/14 the recycling credit rate paid to third parties in Lancashire is £51.18 per tonne of material recycled. Since the introduction of Cost Sharing in 2006 the district waste collection authorities have introduced separate kerbside recycling collections for glass, paper & cardboard, metals, plastics bottles, textiles and green garden waste, and these services now cover over 90% of households in Lancashire.

This improved kerbside recycling network means that there is less need at a local level for third party recycling activities to divert recyclable materials from landfill. Withdrawal of recycling credits may slightly affect recycling levels although the impacts on Lancashire's overall waste diverted from landfill will be negligible.

The withdrawal of the credits would reduce some of the income community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups receive, but groups will still retain any additional income from the sale of collected material for recycling via recycling merchants.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

The final proposal is unchanged

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The impact will be reviewed and monitored annually in relation to any decrease in tonnage of recyclate collected by third parties and any changes in tonnage of recyclate collected by district waste collection authorities. This will be a good indicator in any shift change in activity by organisations.