

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Savings from shared service arrangement.	
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£ (10,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£ (10,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£ (10,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>	<p>The Borough Solicitor is currently undertaking a pilot Shared Legal Service with East Northamptonshire Council. The pilot is designed to generate key data for inclusion in a Business Case which will propose a Full Shared Legal Service between the two Council commencing in April 2012.</p>	
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>	<p>Consequences: NBC will generate income by undertaking legal work for ENDC  The resilience of NBC legal services will be improved  NBC legal staff will be afforded a wider range of opportunities in terms of experience and potentially career enhancement.</p> <p>Risks: ENDC Management and or Council decide not to pursue the proposal  ENDC do not generate the level of work anticipated thereby reducing the level of income achievable</p>	
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>	N/A	
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>	There are no equalities aspects to the proposal for NBC.	
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>	N/A	
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>	N/A	
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b>	<a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A	
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>	N/A	
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>	N/A	

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Restructure in Chief Executive's Office.	
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£ (40,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£ (40,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£ (40,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b> This option is still being worked up and will be included in the February budget report.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a></b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		

**General Fund MTP Option Descriptions**

--

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Introduce paperless Committees at the Council
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Department:</b>
Budget	Saving
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£ (5,000) including spend on ICT equipment
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£ (5,000)
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£ (5,000)
<b>Brief Description:</b>	
<p>Councillors are often provided with paper copies of meeting agendas and reports even if they are not members of the committee in question. As an initial step it is proposed to review the circulation of all papers to member meetings and only print copies where the member is part of that meeting. Members could of course choose to print their own papers should they require a paper copy.</p> <p>The second step would be to ask Overview and Scrutiny to undertake a review as to whether or not the council could move to a “paperless” position utilising technology. For example Councillors would be able to down load papers onto their lap tops which they would need to then take to meetings.</p> <p>The main benefit of this would be the elimination of paper. It will allow for the Committees to run more effectively and efficiently using ICT to its full capacity. Councillors will not have to search papers; information will be available on screen. Documents will be projected on a large screen for the benefit of both the Councillors and public attendees.</p> <p>The Project will benefit Councillors further as they will not need to bring anything to meetings. Electronic data will be available upon arrival. ICT devices will be fully charged and ready for use during the meeting.</p> <p>The Project will create benefits to the Council such as financial savings; highlight the Council as modern, forward thinking and being environmentally responsible. Going paperless can save money, boost productivity, save space, make documentation and information sharing easier and help the environment.</p> <p>The exact costs of this proposal are difficult to determine as the print costs are "under the line" however they are currently estimated at around £50,000 a year.</p>	
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillors resist the innovation.</li> <li>• Councillors do not log in and read agendas and supporting paperwork prior to the meeting</li> <li>• Councillors require training on how to use ICT devices and the advancement of technology</li> <li>• ICT failure during the meeting.</li> <li>• Software used to manipulate the agendas, e.g. enable the Councillor to make electronic notes requires an upgrade.</li> <li>• Minimum work supplied by Democratic Services to the Print Room</li> <li>• Poor publicity in response to the purchase of ICT equipment.</li> <li>• Democratic Services Officers required to take the minutes at the meeting electronically</li> <li>• Information will be accessible easier and faster for all stakeholders.</li> </ul>	
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>): - N/A</b>	

### General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

**Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.**

Yes. Excellent communication strategies are key components to counteracting the implications of the Project. There is a need to ensure all Councillors are fully trained on the use of the ICT devices at the meeting, making electronic notes and accessing other documents. A Training Plan for the Project has been compiled together with clear communication channels.

The implementation of paperless committees could be harmful to one or more of the protected characteristic groups, therefore there is a need to ensure that it is accessible to these groups and enables them to participate fairly and access information of meetings of the Council

General (all protected characteristics): The Project Co-Ordinator is mindful of the eight protected characteristics when undertaking this Project so that any recommendations that it makes can identify potential positive and negative impacts on any particular sector of the community. This will be taken into consideration as the Project progresses and evidence is gathered.

Disability: There are no arrangements in place such as sign language interpreters at meetings.

**If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?**

General (all protected characteristics): Training will be given to all Councillors and relevant Officers involved in the Project so that Councillors will be able to fully participate in paperless Committees and Officers will be able to provide advice and support to ensure, wherever possible, the Project is meeting equality and diversity duties.

Disability: The agenda and supporting paperwork are downloadable in both RTF and PDF format. It will be ensured that the software allows for Councillors, Officers and the general public to change the size of the font to enable them to have full access to the information relating to the meetings.

A number of large screens and microphones will be installed in the Council's main meeting rooms so that all attendees have equal access to the meeting content.

**How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?**

Meetings were held between key officers from Democratic Services and CEX Services and ICT, who will be part of this Project to identify the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics. Councillors will be engaged at the earliest appropriate time prior to commencement of the Project.

**How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (Growth items only)** <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/> - N/A

**How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?**

The Project will be regularly evaluated and feedback received. A simple questionnaire regarding Paperless Committees will be produced for completion by Councillors, Officers and the general public attending meetings. Specific questions regarding the impact on people with protected characteristics will be asked.

**Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?**

No. Alternative methods have been analysed

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	NNDR Refunds following appeals.	
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£ (35,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£ (20,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£ (10,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>A total net increase of £35,000 in 2012/13 in the amount of refunds obtainable from appeals against rateable values and reliefs of NNDR for other reasons. The figures relate to savings in this service's budget. Ongoing reductions in future years, arising from reductions in NNDR payable for operational property, will accrue to the relevant service's budget, not Regeneration</p> <p>The precise level of refunds and reliefs obtainable cannot be ascertained at this time. Estimate of savings based upon preliminary scope for reductions in rateable values from limited pool of properties (where 'profits' method used to calculate RV's). Option will have no impact upon service. External fee costs met from refunds on "no win, no fee" basis.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> - None		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> - N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
N/A		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> - N/A		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
N/A		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Planning Department Restructure.	
<b>Directorate: Planning and Regen</b>	<b>Department: Planning</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£ (47,413)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£ (47,413)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£ (47,413)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>	Staff Savings/Restructure within Planning Department	
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>	The objective of this restructure is to ensure that the department is better equipped in terms of technical and IT skills to meet the operational challenges as a result of the transfer of WNDC planning powers back to the authority. It is estimated that up to 4 members of staff may be affected and there is an overall reduction of 4 posts to 2 posts. However, the requirements of the new posts are such that staff will have to be retrained and up-skilled in order to provide an adequate level of support to the professional staff to support major projects.	
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>	N/A	
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>	No. This work is already being done by WNDC, the administrative transfer ensures that the statutory requirements are still being met and that NBC can deliver an equal level of service to the public, including those with protected characteristics.	
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>	N/A	
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>	N/A	
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b>	<a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A	
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>	N/A	
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>	N/A	

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Reduction in Joint Planning Unit contribution.
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Department:</b>
Budget	Saving/ Growth
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£ (30,700)
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£ (30,700)
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£ (30,700)
<b>Brief Description:</b>	
Reduction in our contribution to the JPU budget. No impact and recommended.	
A reduction in the contribution of NBC to the Joint Planning Unit of £30,700 2012/13 due to unexpected delays to the progress of the Joint Core Strategy arising from uncertainty due to the changes to the national planning framework at national level and a review of the work programme.	
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>	
The progress of the JCS has been delayed by several months and expenditure expected in 2011/12 has been rescheduled to 2012/13. This delay has no significant risks.	
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>): - N/A</b>	
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>	
No, the work will be completed but with a delay in the timetable.	
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>	
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>	
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>	
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>	
N/A	
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>	



## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Increase in Planning Application Fees
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Department:</b>
Budget	Saving
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£ (43,425)
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£ (43,425)
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£ (43,425)
<b>Brief Description:</b> Increase in Planning Application Fees (amount still to be confirmed).	
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> This is an estimate of the increase in fees likely to occur in 2012/13 based on the revised forecast for 2011/12, together with the possibility of a non-discretionary increase in planning application fees due to changes in the statutory fee regulations. The risk is that the level of fee may not be achievable due to the current economic circumstances continuing to depress the demand for new development, or that the Government may not increase fees from April 2012.	
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> N/A	
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No. The current fee regulations make provision for exemption for some categories of people with protected characteristics. This will not change.	
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> - N/A	
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> - N/A	
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> N/A. Any increase in fees by Central Government will be subject to a separate assessment undertaken at national level.	
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> - N/A	
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> – N/A	

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Planning and Performance Agreement	
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£ (50,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£ (50,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£ (50,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
As a result of the transfer of planning powers from WNDC, the Council will be moving to a development management framework of dealing with applications for strategic development proposals. This will encourage developers to enter into Planning Performance Agreements prior to commencing pre-application discussions. This will entail a fee depending on the type and complexity of the development proposed. This is a net saving.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
Failure to move to this system will result in a burden on the resources of the department to the detriment of overall performance and increased costs to the Council.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (Growth items only): - N/A</b>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No. This affects only prospective applicants of major development schemes.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (Growth items only) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Finance & Support Administrative Restructure	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b> Finance and Support	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£25,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£25,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£25,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
This proposal will reduce the staffing level within the finance and support administrative function by 1 fte. The department has implemented improved working practices and has reduced from five heads of services to three. There is therefore scope to reduce the number of staff in this area.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
None. This is a low risk option.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
NO		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Restructure of Finance Service	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b> Finance	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£187,500)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£187,500)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£187,500)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This proposal will significantly reduce staffing levels in finance. In order to achieve this, a number of service delivery changes will need to be put in place. The most significant ones of these are: -</p> <p>The Finance Department will be staffed to deliver the normal daily functions of the service; additional work, such as support for projects, will have to be funded from project budgets</p> <p>In theory, responsibility for forecasting lies with budget managers and heads of service; in practice there is a high level of support from service accountants. The service will be structured such that advice and support can be provided, but at a level more appropriate for a mature organisation; budget managers will be required to take full ownership of their budgets and forecasts and finance will challenge these on an exception basis and report findings to Management Board within the monitoring reports. Services will be risk assessed and visits to budget managers will be prioritised and timetabled on the basis of that risk assessment</p> <p>Adhoc queries will be dealt with via a generic email address and only complex queries or queries that involve detailed service knowledge will be dealt with by a specified service accountant</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
<p>Ownership of budgets and the management of budgets will more clearly sit with budget managers; support from Finance will be reduced but will be targeted through a risk-based assessment of budgets and service areas so that areas most in need of attention receive appropriate levels of support.</p> <p>This is a medium to high risk option, although if the required cultural changes are supported by Management Board and necessary action taken to support these, this can be mitigated to a low risk option.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>): - N/A</b>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain. - No</b>		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
<p>The actual impact (if any) on people with protected characteristics will only become known following the full restructure and consultation process. The process will be assessed at all times to ensure that it is being undertaken in a fair and open manner in accordance with Council policies and procedures.</p>		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		

### General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

There is no unequal impact on any people with protected characteristics. If a member of staff with protected characteristics is affected, it will be after a fair, consultative process undertaken in line with Council policies and procedures.

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Saving on VAT advice expenditure	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b> Finance	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£15,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£15,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£15,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>The Council does not need a full time VAT expert. The Finance department has recently procured a VAT helpline contract and internal knowledge is limited to a basic level. The balance of the current VAT budget could be retained within Finance budget and used to cover any other additional specialist VAT advice required from our provider. However, if it turns out that no queries are raised that cannot be answered through the helpdesk (they will only need additional funding if they are complex and involved), then this budget will remain unused. Complex and involved queries are likely to come up when the Council is involved in some specific projects, such as Grosvenor Greyfriars, etc. It is probably more appropriate therefore that any additional VAT advice arising from these projects are funded from the project budgets. The need for advice can therefore be factored in to the consideration of whether to embark on a particular project rather than from a specific VAT advice budget which may end up being largely superfluous.</p> <p>If this option is adopted, therefore, any VAT queries related to a specific project (aside from those that can be answered through the helpline in any case) will involve additional external advice from our provider that must be funded through the projects</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
This is a low risk option, assuming that funding for additional VAT advice is funded through project budgets.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> - N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
By the nature of a VAT helpline accessed by Finance staff, there are no other stakeholders to engage.		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
By the nature of a VAT helpline accessed by Finance staff, there are no impacts on people with protected characteristics to measure.		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

**people with protected characteristics?**

There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Reduction in External Audit Fee	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b> Finance	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£35,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£35,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£35,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This option is based on the current Audit Commission consultation on fees for 2012/13 and calculated against existing fees.</p> <p>The figures for 2012/13 are dependent upon the outcome of the consultation. The cost for future years may change depending on the outcome of the national tendering exercise and which firm gets assigned to the Northampton area.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
<p>This is a low to medium risk option. The key risk is that the actual fees vary from those currently projected by the Audit Commission.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
<p>By the nature of the External Audit service, primarily liaising with Finance staff, there are no other stakeholders to engage.</p>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
<p>By the nature of the External Audit service, primarily liaising with Finance staff, there are no impacts on people with protected characteristics to measure.</p>		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
<p>There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.</p>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Increase Debt Management Risk	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b> Finance	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£60,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£60,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£60,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This option involves accepting greater risk within our debt management portfolio. Increased risk can arise from a number of different aspects including widening the counter party list (who we are willing to lend to) and investing reserves over a longer period. Arguably, widening the counterparty list is more risky because the Council would be investing in bank or countries with a lower credit rating. The effect of lengthening investment periods is linked to this in that the longer the period of investment, the greater the probability that one of the counterparties, that was previously assessed as acceptable, has a worsening credit rating over the period of the investment. The brief analysis below looks at lengthening investment periods.</p> <p>Based on the rates on Monday 3 October 2011 the average difference between the 3 month rate and the 12 month rate was 0.822%, equivalent to £8,223 per annum for each £1m invested for the longer period. Obviously rates and the average gap vary day to day.</p> <p>We would not be able to put all of our cash out long for cash flow reasons, but we have a few million in core cash that we could get this benefit from if we were to increase our risk appetite.</p> <p>We would almost certainly need to amend the Treasury Strategy as this currently says we "will use the recommendations of the creditworthiness service provided by the Council's external treasury advisers to determine suitable counterparties and the maximum period of investment, using the ratings assigned" as well as the corresponding TMPs and schedules. Going out long at the present time would not be in line with Sector advice (our Treasury Advisers). However, other local authorities are now going out for longer time periods.</p> <p>Since Iceland and the general banking crash, the Treasury Management code of practice was amended so that Treasury management decisions have to consider Security, Liquidity, and Yield (SLY) in that order. However, this must be a balanced view and the Yield aspect should not be ignored entirely.</p> <p>The risk is that we either have to pay a premium to recover the money early if we feel we need to at any stage or that the money is locked out with risk to the principal as happened with Iceland.</p> <p>Under the new regulations, changing the risk appetite on Treasury Management is to be as much something for consideration by members as the s.151 officer. Members would therefore have to specifically accept that Treasury Management decisions were being made that were higher risk.</p> <p>The figures above assume that the whole of our £20m core cash is put out and the interest differential is 0.6%. Half of the benefit (approximately) would pass to the HRA.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
The risk is that we either have to pay a premium to recover the money early if we feel we need to at any stage or that the money is locked out with risk to the principal as happened with Iceland.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (Growth items only): - N/A</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<p><b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b></p> <p>No</p>
<p><b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b></p>
<p><b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b></p> <p>By the nature of the debt management service, operated by Finance staff, there are no other stakeholders to engage.</p>
<p><b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (Growth items only) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b></p>
<p><b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b></p> <p>By the nature of the debt management service, operated by Finance staff, there are no impacts on people with protected characteristics to measure.</p>
<p><b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b></p> <p>There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.</p>



## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Re-organisation of ICT Service	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b> ICT	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£70,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£70,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£70,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This proposal will reduce staffing levels within the ICT Service. The service is currently undergoing a Strategic Business Review to ensure that it is fit for purpose for the future delivery of transformational change to the Council. Part of this review involves a market test and it is essential to ensure that our establishment is lean and that any potential savings are extracted prior to the market test. The ICT service establishment was significantly restructured and reduced last year. During the year volumes of work have been monitored and these are changing in type due to the roll-out of new technologies. With cross-training and increased automation it is proposed to reduce the staffing levels</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> - None		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> – N/A		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
<p>The actual impact (if any) on people with protected characteristics will only become known following the full restructure and consultation process. The process will be assessed at all times to ensure that it is being undertaken in a fair and open manner in accordance with Council policies and procedures</p>		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
<p>There is no unequal impact on any people with protected characteristics. If a member of staff with protected characteristics is affected, it will be after a fair, consultative process undertaken in line with Council policies and procedures.</p>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Cease postage to Councillors and introduce a Guildhall collection point	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£1,984)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£1,984)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£1,984)	
<b>Brief Description:</b> It is proposed to stop using the royal mail or other postal services to deliver Councillors correspondence. Instead all items would be left for collection at the Guildhall or sent to them electronically.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> None		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> - N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> - N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> - N/A		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> This links to Paperless Committees at the Council. The Project will be regularly evaluated and feedback received. A simple questionnaire regarding Paperless Committees will be produced for completion by Councillors, Officers and the general public attending meetings. Specific questions regarding the impact on people with protected characteristics will be asked. The Implementation Plan proposes how evaluation and feedback will be obtained.		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> No. – This is linked to Paperless Committees as the Council:-		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Review of National Non Domestic Rates Concessionary Scheme.	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	0	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	Option 1 - (£130,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	Option 1 - (£130,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>Currently the Council has the discretionary power to grant additional National Non Domestic Rate (NNDR) relief to charities or relief to similar organisations under the Local Government Finance Act 1988 who satisfy either of the criteria below on both occupied (Section 47) and unoccupied property (Section 48).</p> <p>Each application for discretionary relief is considered on its own merit and there is no blanket policy for determining the award.</p> <p>The Government's Resource Review, which is due to be implemented from April 2013, will fundamentally change the way local authorities are funded. One of the key elements of the proposals is to retain NNDR locally and this is likely to have a major impact on both the mandatory and discretionary elements of the scheme.</p> <p>In order for a change to be made from April 2013, a decision would be required, and communicated to the affected ratepayers, giving notice of the decision prior to the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012. Whilst delegated powers exist for the granting of relief, a decision by Full Council could be more appropriate if a fundamental change to the basis for granting relief is made. It would be reasonable to undertake this as part of budget process. This option therefore gives notice of the withdrawal of the scheme.</p> <p>NBC wishes to work with the Charity and non-profit making organisations and other local authority partners during 2012/13 to develop a scheme once the implications of the localisation of NNDR are announced and understood.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
This option will allow the Council to give the required statutory notice of withdrawal of the current scheme and aims work with partners to develop a new scheme once the implications of the local government resource review is known.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>): N/A</b>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
Yes, this option could impact on people with protected characteristics dependant upon the final shape of the local government resource review.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b>		
By working with partners to develop a new scheme it is anticipated that this will be mitigated.		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

protected characteristics? N/A
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (Growth items only)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> By working with partners the actual impact of the new scheme will be captured.
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> This will be developed with partners during 2012/13 once the impact of the new scheme is known.

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Re-organisation of Benefits Service	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b> Revenue & Benefits	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£80,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£80,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£80,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This would consider a re – structure across the service and would be focused on preparing the revenues and benefits service for reforms of the revenues and benefit systems across the next 10 years. Providing a contingency for business rates could also be created and the possibility of cross management of some teams. We also need to consider parts of the services workload that could cease as a result of reform. This option also includes reducing the number of assessment staff by one as a result of automating some processes.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
<p>The re-structure although potentially reducing the number of staff employed within the service focuses on delivering more for less. Therefore performance of the teams would remain unchanged.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>): - N/A</b>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics</b>		
There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Income from external training	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£3,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£3,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£3,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b> We now have a standard range of training courses both facilitated and online. The aim here is to offer external chargeable places on courses we are already planning to run for our own staff.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> We could see an impact on training quality internally if these courses are over subscribed, however we will work to ensure this does not occur and priority is given to internal staff training.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Reduction in print & dispatch of daily and annual bills & letters	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£15,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£15,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£15,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
This would involve a complete review of all in year print and dispatch, alongside our large year-end billing process. Obtaining quotes, including an in – house quote would aim to deliver a cost reduction.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
An emphasis on quality will need to be considered as part of any revised service delivery. This would remove any risk of customers receiving in – adequate bills or notifications.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>): - N/A</b>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
N/A		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Business Rates Consortium Efficiency	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b> Business rates	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£10,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£10,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£10,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b> As part of reduced running costs within our business rates consortium we will aim to achieve savings in 2012 / 13.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> By meeting the saving the key risk could be a reduction in business rate collection. This would be closely monitored and performance managed.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (Growth items only):</b> - N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> N/A		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> – N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> - N/A		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (Growth items only)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.		



## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Reducing the cost of Bed and Breakfast accommodation through use of Council Housing	
<b>Directorate:</b> Finance & Support	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£100,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£100,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£100,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>The Council is looking at utilising Council properties in 2012-2013 for housing the homeless.</p> <p>The aim of this proposal is to reduce the loss in housing benefit subsidy currently experienced through the use of Bed and Breakfast accommodation, which carries a large cost.</p> <p>The Council will use the housing stock as a cheaper alternative to using bed and breakfast accommodation, and provide more appropriate short term accommodation for families with children.</p> <p>With homelessness increasing nationally, this option will contribute to minimising the cost to the Council of temporary accommodation</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
<p>The main risk relates to the risk of homelessness applications increasing to a level that exceeds the expected availability of HRA properties that replace bed and breakfast units. This could occur due to reductions in housing benefit levels coming into force in early 2012/13.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> - N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
<p>N/A – Increases in the use of bed and breakfast accommodation above the expected level would need to be monitored through monthly budget analysis of our spend. We have a statutory duty and therefore any overspend would need to be met.</p>		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? Yes – as above.</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		

**General Fund MTP Option Descriptions**

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Introduce Social lettings fee	
<b>Directorate:</b> Housing GF	<b>Department:</b> Housing	
Budget	Saving/ Growth	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£43,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£62,500)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£82,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
It is proposed to charge a weekly (TBC) fee for each private rented property in the social lettings agency. For example:		
Number of properties x Weekly charge		
Yr 1 £15 x 52 = £780 x 100 = £78k		
Yr 2 125 properties		
Yr 3 150 properties		
Resource implications 1 FTE.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
The delivery of the Social Lettings Agency will promote equality of opportunity issues, as greater access to accommodation will be provided to all sections of society.		
With the reduction of re-letting of Council accommodation falling by 25% and new build affordable housing falling from 200 new build properties each year to 80 properties each year, it is essential that the Social Lettings Agency is launched to promote access to accommodation, provide wider options of alternative accommodation, meet the statutory duties placed on the Council, and promote equality of opportunity.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
If the Social Lettings Agency is not developed then vulnerable families will remain in inappropriate and expensive Bed and Breakfast accommodation for longer periods of time. Children's education will suffer and additional and unnecessary stress will be placed on families.		
The opportunities for families to access safe and secure accommodation will be reduced and Northampton Borough Council will continue to breach the DCLG 6 week rule, with further negative publicity.		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a></b>		
Promotes wide options and choice for all sections of society		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
Through Equality Impact Assessments and performance monitoring measures		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.	
<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Increase Choice based lettings charge
<b>Directorate:</b> Housing GF	<b>Department:</b> Housing
Budget	Saving/ Growth
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£5,000)
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£5,000)
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£5,000)
<b>Brief Description:</b> Charges per letting to rise from £70 per property to £75 based on approx 1,000 lettings a year and by a further £5 in each of the subsequent 2 years.	
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> The delivery of the additional income will have no risks as all Registered Social Landlords and the Housing Revenue Account will be paying the additional fee for the service provided.	
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> There will be reduced income that will impact on the health of the General Fund	
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No	
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>	
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>	
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A	
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> N/A	
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> There is no impact on people with protected characteristics.	

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Enhanced Housing Management Charge	
<b>Directorate:</b> Housing GF	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£(390,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£(416,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£(455,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>It is proposed to charge all vulnerable council tenants a weekly service charge of £15 per week to provide support to live independently and maintain tenancies. This charge would be payable through Housing Benefits for anyone in receipt of income support of JSA.</p> <p>Eg. 500 tenants x £780 pa</p> <p>2013/14 £16.00 charge 2014/15 £17.50 charge</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
Customers that are vulnerable may not be provided with services that enable them to retain their independence if the Enhanced Housing Management Charge and Gateway service and related services are not made available.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
Higher % of evictions from Council accommodation, vulnerable customers not maintaining their tenancies, higher volume of vulnerable people sleeping on the streets.		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No this service would promote equality of opportunity and positively breakdown barriers to service delivery.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a></b>		
Promotes equality of opportunity and addresses barriers to service delivery		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
Equality Impact Assessment will be introduced and regular performance management measures reported upon.		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - No</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Reduction in management fee to Northampton Leisure Trust	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£200,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£400,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£600,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>As was the plan from inception, this proposal is to reduce the management fee the council pays to the Northampton Leisure Trust in return for delivering services in accordance with outcomes set out the management agreement.</p> <p>In its first year of trading, the trust has strengthened its trading position through the achievement of efficiencies and an increase in income and has therefore been able to agree with the council a reduction in management fee in return for maintaining the outcomes it delivers on behalf of the council.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal: - None</b>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
None		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
No impact		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - No</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Review of Westbridge Administration	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£100,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£120,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£120,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This proposal is entirely focused on back office activities. It proposes a further review of administrative services provided to support functions undertaken at Westbridge depot.</p> <p>Last year all generic admin functions were brought together to achieve efficiencies. This proposal will involve further integrating and streamlining activities to achieve additional efficiencies. It will include a review of admin activities in the environmental services partnership unit.</p> <p>There will be no impact on services to the public arising from this savings proposal.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> - None		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> - N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> - N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> - N/A		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> - No		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Review of Town Centre Operations Administration	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£25,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£25,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£25,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b> Review of administrative functions undertaken to support town centre operations to achieve efficiencies through better ways of working.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> This proposal will have no impact on the service delivered to the public.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> None		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - No</b>		



## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Review of Museum Service	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b> Museums	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£25,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£50,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£100,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>	Review of museum income via corporate sponsorship, donations and income received in the museum shop.	
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>	The service will need to develop a more commercially minded approach to what it does overall	
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>	None	
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>	None at this stage	
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>	N/A	
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Restructure of Community Safety & Licensing administrative functions	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b> Public Protection	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£35,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£110,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£110,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b> Review of the following areas: Year 1 Community Safety/Licensing section Year 2, Public Protection Division wide		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> Reduced resources for delivering some Community Safety projects but compensated by involvement of Neighbourhood management resources. Funded projects are likely to reduce due to current economic situation. Outcome will lead to a more flexible Licensing resource, with more focus on the enforcement element of the service and clear structure/supervision within the administrative team.  Year 2 may need some realignment of management/ reporting structures that could impact on these parts within other service areas of the council. Business case will be drafted at the appropriate time in 12/13		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>): - N/A</b>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No-Reduced activity compensated by other services		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> Wider use of Neighbourhood management within Community Safety will continue to improve the coordination and effectiveness of partnership agencies.		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> Neighbourhood Management are aware and its management is actively working with CS to share action plans		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> Ongoing analysis of Community Safety statistics and Community Safety consultation		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? – No</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Withdrawal of funding of Police Community Support Officers	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b> Public Protection	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£100,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£100,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£100,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This proposal may result in Northamptonshire Police providing 5 less Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) if they do not decide to replace this loss of funding from another source. They currently employ 162 PCSOs across the county. It is understood that the county council are also considering whether to withdraw the funding of £500,000 they make to Northamptonshire Police for PCSOs, which could result in an additional reduction of up to 26 PCSOs.</p> <p>It is estimated that this could result in up to 20 fewer PCSOs operating in Northampton.</p> <p>Some of this impact will be offset by the work of the relaunched neighbourhood wardens and the newly established park rangers. Both of these roles provide a lower cost and more flexible resource to address local issues in the town.</p> <p>If this proposal is agreed, discussions will take place with the Police and county council to minimise the impact on the public of its implementation and to ensure smooth transition.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
Northamptonshire Police may provide less PCSOs		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> None		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
Although all residents will potentially be affected if the number of PCSOs is reduced by the police as a result of NBC withdrawing funding more vulnerable sections of the community may be more affected. The police will need to mitigate this risk in the way they respond to this funding cut.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b>		
Through discussions with the police. Our response will depend on what the police decide to do.		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
This process will need to be undertaken by the police.		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
This will be dependent on police response and will be undertaken by the police		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on</b>		

**General Fund MTP Option Descriptions**

**people with protected characteristics? - No**

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Review of Close Circuit Television operations	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Saving	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£39,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£68,600)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£68,600)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>Year 1 impact of this proposal is minimal and entails a reduction in evening shift coverage from 2 to 1 on Sun, Mon, Tue &amp; Wed nights. There will be lone worker issues that will need to be appropriately managed. When Operatives have to take breaks away from the screen there will be short periods with no live visual cover of the screen.</p> <p>Year2 onwards,13/14/15. Turning off CTV Cameras where evidence indicates their contribution to the prevention or detection of crime and anti social behaviour to be minimal .</p> <p>The possibility of external funding for cameras will be explored during 12/13 which if available would enable more cameras to remain on.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
Crimes or anti social behaviour may be reported to the police less promptly or may be unreported. Detection and conviction rates of crimes may be affected.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
All people within town potentially affected, although may be a greater impact on vulnerable members of the community. There will be a reduced ability to respond to police calls as contractual obligations will be given priority.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b>		
Raise awareness with Police of reduced service being provided		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
Police have been advised.		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - No.</b>		

**General Fund MTP Option Descriptions**

--

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Withdrawal of Daventry from Close Circuit Television Shared service	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Growth	
Budget Increase 2012/13	£12,000	
Budget Increase 2013/14	£12,000	
Budget Increase 2014/15	£12,000	
<b>Brief Description:</b> DDC are to withdraw from Close Circuit Television monitoring service for Daventry with effect from 04/03/2012		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> Reduced income has to be compensated		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> Budget deficit will impact negatively upon rest of service budget		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No - affects are with DCC area		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> A matter for DCC		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - No</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Establishment of a Councillor Empowerment Fund	
<b>Directorate:</b> ACE	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Growth	
Budget Increase 2012/13	£135,000	
Budget Increase 2013/14	£135,000	
Budget Increase 2014/15	£135,000	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>It is proposed to establish a Council Empowerment Fund. A Councillor Empowerment Fund is a Scheme which grants a set sum, £3,000 per year to each of the Council's elected Councillors to spend within their electoral ward.</p> <p>The development of a Councillor Empowerment Fund Scheme links to the Council's corporate priorities - Corporate priority 1 (Supporting you when you need it) – Supporting community involvement and give you opportunity to take part. The Corporate Plan 2012/2013 is currently in development and it is anticipated that the Scheme will be identified as a Corporate priority.</p> <p>Part 1 of the Local Government Act 2000 gives Councils broader powers to promote the social, economic and environmental well being of its area. This power brings with it benefits for Authorities and local communities through more effective relationships with partners and the public, greater freedoms and flexibilities and the ability to be innovative and creative. It is of particular relevance to promoting Councillors' community leadership role and the development of Empowering Councillors and Communities Schemes.</p> <p>The Administration, in its Manifesto, gave its commitment to the development of a "<i>Councillor Community Fund Scheme for Borough Councillors to allocate money within their ward to make a positive impact on the areas they represent and to empower local residents who are active in their communities. A Conservative administration will consult Northamptonshire County Council and use best practice and advice from the successful Empowering Councillors and Communities Scheme</i>".</p> <p>This would be funded from the New Homes bonus reserve.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The benefits of a Councillor Empowerment Scheme include allowing Community Groups to do things that they might not otherwise be able to afford to do. This should benefit the specific group and also potentially the wider community either locally or across the district.</li> <li>• Lack of Councillor engagement in the Scheme – It will be the Councillors' responsibility to promote the Scheme within their ward, raise interest, assist organisations in completing their application forms, communicating their final decision and any positive outcomes of the Fund.</li> <li>• Not all Councillors spend their allocation, as the onus is on Councillors to seek out organisations which may be in need of support.</li> <li>• The proposed Scheme states that all monies should be spent in each financial year or forfeited which will help to make the Scheme as simple as possible</li> <li>• Community Groups that 'shout the loudest' are often responded to the most, which raises concerns regarding equitability of the Scheme</li> <li>• The administration of Schemes elsewhere appear to be resource heavy, it is estimated that officer time to administer the proposed Scheme at Northampton equates to 0.07</li> </ul>		



### General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

FTE – drawing from resources from Finance, Chief Executive’s Office and Political Assistants.

- Community Groups may have:
  - Lack of experience of applying for funds.
  - Lack of understanding what the funds are for.
  - Lack of understanding/clarity of what the funds are available for.

#### Mitigation

**Councillor Community Fund Scheme for Borough Councillor** - The Corporate Communications Team to be asked to assist in generating positive publicity for the Scheme and promote examples of projects the Scheme has funded. Political Assistants, in collaboration with the Corporate Communications Team, assist Councillors in communicating how they have spent their Funds.

**Not all Councillors spend their allocation** - The Voluntary and Community Sector Forum has offered to promote the Scheme through its network which should generate interest in local groups contacting their ward Councillors for potential funding through the Scheme.

**Community Groups that ‘shout the loudest’ are often responded to the most** – The promotion of the Scheme through the Voluntary and Community Sector Forum should help to promote the Scheme amongst all Community Groups within that network. The need to evaluate the Scheme on a regular basis is recognised by methods such as an Annual Survey to all those who received funds. Details could be reported in an Annual Report.

**Community Groups lack of experience and understanding** - the Voluntary and Community Sector Forum feel that Groups within its network may require assistance in completing application forms and contacting their local ward Councillor. An annual event promoting the Scheme will be useful in promoting its value to local Groups and organisations.

**The administration of Schemes elsewhere appear to be resource heavy** - Required resources could be split as follows, which will not put the burden upon one department:

- **Political Assistants:** Provide support and advice to Councillors in completing forms and obtaining feedback for monitoring and reporting purposes (approximately 55 hours per year total)
- **Chief Executive’s Office:** Review and approve applications (including referring them back to the Councillor and Political Assistant if further information is required), provide support and advice to any Group that does not have a Political Assistant and compile the quarterly and annual reports (approximately 55 hours per year)
- **Finance:** Processing and issuing cheques for payment (approximately 22.5 hours per year)

#### **Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (*Growth items only*):**

The commitment of the Administration to develop *Councillor Community Fund Scheme for Borough Councillors* will not be met.

The Scheme will enable Councillors to respond to local needs in their wards and support projects or activities for the benefit of the communities which they represent. Without the introduction of such a Scheme, Councillors will not be able to support such projects.

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Funding for the cost of the delivery of Northampton Waterside Enterprise Zone	
<b>Directorate:</b> Planning & Regen	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Growth	
Budget Increase 2012/13	£430,000	
Budget Increase 2013/14	£185,000	
Budget Increase 2014/15	£185,000	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>Following Government approval of the Northampton Waterside Enterprise Zone in August 2011, NBC has started to plan the successful delivery of the Zone on behalf of SEMLEP. Whilst delivery costs need to be discussed by the SEMLEP Board, NBC as the delivery vehicle needs to ensure it has the right skills and resources to enable a positive start. If it does not, then it runs of the risk of under delivery at the expense of investments in other areas and enterprise zones.</p> <p>The amount requested is a conservative estimate of what would be required.</p> <p>This would be funded initially from the New Homes Bonus reserve, but it is anticipated that this funding would be repaid from additional revenue from National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR) or its replacement as and when funding streams are received from new businesses in the enterprise zone.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal: N/A</b>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
Not delivering the EZ project would have a major impact on reputation locally, regionally and nationally. Failure to deliver new investment, 1000's of new jobs, and loss of business uplift.		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
N/A		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured? – N/A</b>		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Increases in planned maintenance survey budget to match volume of work.	
<b>Directorate:</b> Planning & Regen	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Growth	
Budget Increase 2012/13	£50,000	
Budget Increase 2013/14	£50,000	
Budget Increase 2014/15	£50,000	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>There has been an historic demand for planned maintenance work that has not been carried out due to budget limitations which has resulted in consequential demands on the reactive works budget and greater costs as a result. Inadequate spend over time on capital renewals and refurbishments has led to failures. The overall standard of property maintenance needs to be improved. This budget increase will contribute in part to the cost of works identified in the 2007-11 condition survey.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal: - N/A</b>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
<p>Maintenance backlog increases with extra pressure for reactive maintenance and failures. High risk of increased costs as back log builds and diminution of asset</p>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
N/A		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> N/A</b>		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Neighbourhood Planning Budget for support arising from localism bill	
<b>Directorate:</b> Planning & Regen	<b>Department:</b>	
Budget	Growth	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£30,000	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£30,000	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£30,000	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This is an additional statutory duty imposed through the Localism Act for which there is no provision in the existing budget. This will allow the department to support the preparation of three neighbourhood plans in 2012/13. This budget will be supported through the CLG front runner project with a grant of £20,000 per plan. This budget will be re-assessed for the 2013/14 budget in the light of experience, emerging Regulations and any future grants.</p> <p>This would be funded from the New Homes Bonus Reserve.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal: N/A</b>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
The Council will fail to support communities sufficiently as required by the Localism Act.		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No. Neighbourhood plans have to conform to the higher order plans, which are subject to full EqIA's. Each neighbourhood plan will also have to be accompanied by a full EqIA.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a></b>		
This will enable the Council to support local communities who wish to prepare their own plans in accordance with the provisions of the Localism Act.		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
Through full EqIA's for each individual neighbourhood plan.		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? – N/A</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Impact of transfer of regaining planning powers from WNDC	
<b>Directorate:</b> Planning & Regen	<b>Department:</b> Planning	
Budget	Saving/ Growth	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£52,230	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£52,230	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£52,230	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
This is required as a result of legislative change to enable the Council to perform its statutory duties as local planning authority under the TCP Act following the transfer of Planning Powers from WNDC from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2012.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal: - N/A</b>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
<p>The Council will have insufficient staff resources to undertake its statutory duties without a significant and deleterious impact on performance and reputation without an increase in staff numbers and expertise. The transfer of staff to the authority will be undertaken as part of the agreed transfer arrangements with DCLG under COSOP rules.</p> <p>The total cost of £237,230 is off-set by an estimated increase in planning application fees of £175,000. This is an estimate of the increase in fees likely to occur in 2012/13 based on the current forecast for fee income for WNDC in 2011/12, together with the possibility of a non-discretionary increase in planning application fees due to changes in the statutory fee regulations. The risk is that this level of fee may not be achievable due to the current economic circumstances continuing to depress the demand for new development, or that the Government may not increase fees from April 2012. It is anticipated that there will be 6 posts in total.</p>		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No. This is an administrative transfer of a statutory function from one public body to another. The current fee regulations make provision for exemption for some categories of people with protected characteristics. This will not change.		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? – N/A</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b>		
There was a full public consultation undertaken by the Government in 2009/10.		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured? – N/A</b>		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

on people with protected characteristics? – N/A
---

MTP Title/Ref:	<b>Creation of a hardship fund to assist people defray costs of rat control</b>	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b> Public Protection	
Budget	Growth	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£40,000	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£40,000	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£40,000	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>This option would create a hardship fund to assist residents in Northampton whose financial position makes it difficult to cover the cost of this service. The fund will be managed by the Public Protection Service but will be provided a commercial partner appointed through a tender process.</p> <p>It is proposed overview and scrutiny are asked to develop an appropriate scheme that identifies the criteria against which the allocation of funds will be made to customers applying to the fund.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
That the fund will be insufficient to meet need.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>		
Public and councillors will be disappointed that an issue that many consider to be important will not be met.		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>		
No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b>		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a></b>		
A hardship fund will assist the most economically disadvantaged members of our communities		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>		
Through service monitoring		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? No</b>		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	<b>Vat increase on parking income (2.5%)</b>	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b> Town centre Operations	
Budget	Saving/ Growth	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£97,000	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£97,000	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£97,000	
<b>Brief Description:</b> In his 2010 Emergency Budget the Chancellor announced an increase in the standard rate of VAT from 17.5 per cent to 20 per cent, effective from 4 January 2011. For practical reasons a decision was taken not to pass the increase on to car park users and to instead absorb the increase. This pressure however was not taken account of in the 2011/12 budget in relation to its impact on car parking income and therefore will lead to a projected budget shortfall.  This growth bid is to cover the VAT increase impact in future years, which is calculated at £97k per year.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b> - N/A		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> The car park budget will be overspent.		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> - N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> - N/A		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> N/A		
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> No		

## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Car park Standardisation	
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b> Town centre Operations	
Budget	Saving/ Growth	
Budget Reduction 2012/13	(£160,000)	
Budget Reduction 2013/14	(£160,000)	
Budget Reduction 2014/15	(£160,000)	
<b>Brief Description:</b>		
<p>The council's car parks are currently designated as either 'Premier' or 'Standard'. Whilst the majority of car parks are designated 'premier', seven car parks (Chalk Lane, Doddridge Street, Marefair, Horsemarket, Market Street, Melbourne Street and Midsummer Meadow) are designated 'standard'</p> <p>Standard car parks (599 spaces) account for 11.8% of the total parking spaces (5070) in the town. They are located very close to the town centre but have the same facilities and benefits as our premier car parks, but for historic reasons they are around 25% cheaper than other town centre car parks.</p> <p>The purpose of this proposal is to achieve greater fairness in car park charging and remove the incentive to park on the fringes of the town centre and to encourage people into the heart of the town to support the town's retail offer.</p> <p>This proposal will bring all Council car park charges into line in a bid to standardise prices, making them more straightforward and fairer for customers. It will also mean that the reduced parking charges that were introduced in October will now apply.</p> <p>Whilst this may lead to some customers of Standard car parks transferring to those car parks currently designated Premier (due to location) this will enable any under-utilisation of car parks to be closely monitored and alternative uses for sites to be identified.</p>		
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>		
The key risk is that the very positive message that reducing car park charges in premier car parks will be completely undermined.		
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b> N/A		
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b> - No		
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated?</b> – N/A		
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics?</b> - N/A		
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>)</b> <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A		
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b> - N/A		



## General Fund MTP Option Descriptions

Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? – No

<b>MTP Title/Ref:</b>	Free Parking Policy change from October 2011
<b>Directorate:</b> Env & Culture	<b>Department:</b> Town centre Operations
Budget	Growth
Budget Reduction 2012/13	£528,000
Budget Reduction 2013/14	£528,000
Budget Reduction 2014/15	£528,000
<b>Brief Description:</b>	
<p>From October 2011, free and reduced price car parking was introduced in premier car parks, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Free one hour car parking and a 40p reduction for the 2nd hour in the 3 POF premier car parks:</li> <li>• Reduced car parking charges of 20p for the first hour (where one hour charges apply) and 40p for the second hour in all other town centre premier car parks.</li> <li>• Free Sunday car parking in all town centre premier car parks.</li> </ul> <p>The cost implications of these changes have been estimated at £442,000. This growth bid also includes a request for additional funding to cover the underlying downturn income estimated at £86k, arising from reduced footfall in the town centre, associated with the economic downturn.</p>	
<b>Key consequences/risks of delivering the proposal:</b>	
Budget will not be overspent.	
<b>Key consequences/risks of not delivering the proposal (<i>Growth items only</i>):</b>	
Budget will be overspent.	
<b>Does the Equalities Impact Assessment/Screening identify any negative impacts or risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics? If yes, explain.</b>	
No	
<b>If your Assessment/Screening does identify risk of negative impacts on people with protected characteristics, how can these be mitigated? - N/A</b>	
<b>How were stakeholders engaged to assess the risk of a negative impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>	
<b>How does this MTP further the aims of the Public Sector Equalities Duty? (<i>Growth items only</i>) <a href="http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/">http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/introduction-to-the-equality-duty/</a> - N/A</b>	
<b>How will the actual impact on people with protected characteristics be measured?</b>	
N/A	
<b>Are there any alternative ways of delivering this level of saving with less/no impact on people with protected characteristics? - N/A</b>	