

Booklet B – Part 1

**Highland Council
18 December 2014**

Revenue Budget 2015/16 – 2018/19

Details of Budget Savings

Finance Service

Chief Executive's Office

Corporate Development

Development & Infrastructure

Community Services

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Cross Service		
Savings Name	Overtime		
Budget (£m)	£0.200m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference FIN/1

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This proposal reduces the existing provision for overtime across the Service by 75%. This will be achieved through more flexible working and reviewing all existing practices to reduce the need for weekend working.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.150	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.150	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

There are minor risks of potential delays in processing times. However this change has already been implemented in the current financial year without any issues arising.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Negative impact but mitigation identified

There should be no material change to the delivery of services to customers.

Potential staff impact – as loss of overtime for a predominantly female workforce in Finance but mitigated by more flexible working options.

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Negative impact but mitigation identified.

There should be no material change to the delivery of services to customers.

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Corporate Finance		
Savings Name	Efficiencies from new Financial System		
Budget (£m)	£2.879m	Staffing (FTE)	95.56

Reference FIN/3

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Introduction of process improvements leading to more efficient ways of working following the implementation of the new Financial Management Information System (FMIS). FMIS will provide more direct support for services and greater "self-serve", reducing the need for financial support and processing of data.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18	0.168	5
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.168	5

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Review of processes, and additional training of staff across the Council, will be required.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Positive impact identified - The new system should be easier and faster for suppliers and customers. Staff impacts should be assessed across all posts.

Staff impacts

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Positive impact identified - Small positive change for local suppliers and customers – paid more quickly.

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Corporate Finance		
Savings Name	Reduction in external FMIS costs		
Budget (£m)	£0.400m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference FIN/4

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduction in the cost of the Financial Management Information System (FMIS) following successful procurement. The new FMIS is an enhancement on the current system.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.263	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.263	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

There are no risks as this saving has already been achieved, and is due to go live on 1 April 2015. Parallel running of both current and new system is required in 2015/16, therefore full saving is only realisable from 2016/17.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Revenues & Business Support		
Savings Name	Efficiencies & Rationalisations		
Budget (£m)	£7.355m	Staffing (FTE)	517.78

Reference FIN/5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Efficiency savings through the introduction of electronic processes, replacing paper and manual system updates, and rationalisation of the structure following the merger of the two services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.324	14
2016/17	0.200	9
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.524	23

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Positive impact on "Caring Communities" programme through quicker processes for updating benefit information

Deliverability and Risks

No material risks as this work has already started. Detailed work plan has been prepared for process improvements. Staff reductions will be achieved through improved processes and reduced workload. The Service will manage this through reviewing vacancies as they arise, and is already half way towards achieving the staffing reduction.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Positive impact identified for customers as benefit recipients as process improved and faster payment and information.

Potential negative impact for staff group (predominantly women) but mitigated by vacancy management and flexible working.

Staff impacts

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1. No impact

2. **Some impact identified**

3. Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Positive impact identified

Positive impact on benefits recipients locally in rural areas who should receive payments and information faster.

Potential negative impact on staff located in rural areas which could be mitigated against by redirecting work.

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Revenues & Business Support		
Savings Name	Increased Collections		
Budget (£m)	£99.573m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference FIN/6

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increased collection rates, particularly in relation to Council Tax and overpaid Housing Benefit, due to the introduction of more effective ways of working. Main focus of work is to review entitlements to discounts and recovery of overpayments of benefit.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.384	
2016/17	0.138	
2017/18	0.010	
2018/19	0.110	
Aggregate	0.642	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Saving is based on evidence from national studies, and it is assumed that this will apply in Highlands. However this is low risk as discounts have not been reviewed for some time. This proposal will increase the council tax base and reduce the level of bad debt.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Revenues & Business Support		
Savings Name	Continuation of Partnership Working		
Budget (£m)	Nil	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference FIN/7

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Continuation of partnership working in areas of Welfare Reform. This proposal assumes the continuation of an existing contract with existing partners, and is designed to help customers through the provision of advice and online support.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.090	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.090	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Positive impact on "Caring Communities" through additional support services

Deliverability and Risks

There is a small risk should the current roll out of Universal Credit cease through a change in DWP policy.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Cross Service		
Savings Name	Efficiencies & Management of Vacancies		
Budget (£m)	£13.174m	Staffing (FTE)	640.94

Reference FIN/8

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

General efficiency savings, principally through the management of staff vacancies. This will involve reviewing any post that falls vacant, and potentially delaying or not filling the vacancy.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.112	5
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.112	5

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Savings assumes that vacancies will arise. However previous experience supports a level of staff turnover that suggests that this level of saving can be achieved. The Service has over achieved previous targets.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Share Support Services		
Savings Name	Shared Services with Housing		
Budget (£m)	£7.355m	Staffing (FTE)	517.78

Reference FIN/9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared services with Housing Service. This is an opportunity to eliminate duplication between two internal services and provide more effective and targeted service to customers. The immediate focus will be on debt management. Saving is shown for General Fund only, although an equivalent saving should be achievable for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.025	1
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.025	1

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Initial discussions have taken place between Finance and Housing Services, but final proposals have still to be developed. The savings proposal assumes a positive outcome from the development of these proposals.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Positive impact identified for customers process will be streamlined – better service to households in debt and more scope to identify benefit entitlement.

Need to look at staff impact across the organisation affected by post reduction – could be mitigated.

Staff impacts

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Positive impact identified - some positive impact for rural customers

Budget Template

Service	Finance		
Activity Heading	Procurement		
Savings Name	Efficiency Savings		
Budget (£m)	£0.616m	Staffing (FTE)	15.6

Reference FIN/10

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Efficiency savings arising from the implementation of the new Financial Management Information System (FMIS) and management of suppliers' data, including controls over purchasing and payment of goods and services, and contract administration.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.035	1
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.035	1

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

This change will require a successful outcome from the current review of Procurement and the successful implementation of a change in working practices across the Council. Any reduction in staffing will be achieved through the management of vacancies across the service.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Reference	CEO/1
Activity Heading	Policy and Reform				
Savings Name	Policy Team				
Budget (£m)	£0.123m	Staffing (FTE)	3		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduction in staffing costs: staff saving through the re-grading of a vacant post from HC9 to HC8. Already achieved in 2014/15 and approved through Vacancy Scrutiny Group.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.007	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.007	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Saving already achieved in 2014/15.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact

Staff saving through the re-grading of a vacant post. Already achieved in 2014/15 and this proposal will not have any adverse impact on any equality groups.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Policy & Reform		
Savings Name	Policy Discretionary Budgets		
Budget (£m)	£0.120m	Staffing (FTE)	3

Reference CEO/2

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduction in uncommitted discretionary spend held in policy team budgets. The budgets are to support community groups working in mental health improvement and suicide prevention, local equalities groups, community councils training, climate change and support for Highland Third Sector Interface (historic CVS budgets).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	
2016/17	0.005	
2017/18	0.005	
2018/19	0.005	
Aggregate	0.035	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

The Council's Programme has a cross-cutting commitment to the Fairer Highland Plan. Reducing discretionary funding will reduce the scope to provide funding through the Single Grants process.

Deliverability and Risks

Discretionary budgets have a managed underspend each year so reducing the funding from April 2015 is achievable with no immediate impact on groups applying for funding.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Possible negative impact but mitigation identified

Reduction in discretionary grants across policy budgets which include mental health improvement, equalities, and community councils training. Impacts on equalities groups will be avoided by focusing reductions on areas of managed underspend. There may be some reductions in funding to health improvement related groups and we will aim to better work with NHSH on health improvement funding to ensure any impact is limited.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Policy & Reform		
Savings Name	Operational Management		
Budget (£m)	£0.974m	Staffing (FTE)	17

Reference CEO/3

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduction in staffing costs: deleting Head of Service post, merging duties with another Head of Service and creating Manager post at lower grade.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.035	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.035	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

The re-design of the post supports the commitments in the community empowerment theme of the Programme.

Deliverability and Risks

Saving achieved in 2014/15. New post recruited with start date 1.12.14.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Potential for positive impact identified Deleting Head of Service post, merging duties with another Head of Service and creating Manager post at lower grade. Saving achieved in 2014/15. This proposal will not have any adverse impact on any equality groups. There is likely to be a positive impact on communities by supporting community empowerment and ensuring disadvantaged areas and communities are included.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Potential for positive impact identified Deleting Head of Service post, merging duties with another Head of Service and creating Manager post at lower. There is likely to be a positive impact on communities by supporting community empowerment and ensuring disadvantaged areas and communities are included.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Operational Management		
Savings Name	Ward Discretionary Grant		
Budget (£m)	£1.122m	Staffing (FTE)	17

Reference CEO/4

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduction of 12% in ward discretionary budgets over 4 years, spread evenly across all 22 wards, profiled at approx. 3% per annum. Based on the current allocation, WDG per ward would be £53,548 in 2015/16 falling to £48,580 by 2018/19.

Impact of reduction is being consulted on through the budget consultation survey and focus groups.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.036	
2016/17	0.036	
2017/18	0.036	
2018/19	0.036	
Aggregate	0.144	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Council less able to support all requests for funding locally.

Deliverability and Risks

Can be implemented from 1st April 2015. No risks identified.

Consultation feedback

Summary

The survey asked respondents about their views should the Ward Discretionary Budget be reduced by **15%**:

Citizens' Panel – representative views

The Panel were divided on the potential impact of this proposal for them as individuals. 30% reported this **would make no difference** to them and a further 28% that it was **a change that could be coped with**, however 23% indicated that it **could cause some difficulty**. 45% of respondents reported that it **could cause some difficulty** for the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

54% of groups reported that this proposal **could cause some difficulty** to their group. 63% of respondents also indicated that it **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community. This was the proposal causing the most concern to the *Highland Third Sector Interface* and 74% of respondents to their survey expressed that this proposal **could cause some difficulty**.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

Individuals were divided about the potential impact on them as a result of this proposal however 48% indicated that this **could cause some difficult** to the wider community.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>)	
No impact	
This is a proposed reduction in discretionary funding which are one-off payments rather than core funding. The level of the reduction will mean that any negative impacts can be minimized and there is no evidence that there will be negative impact on equality groups. All community groups will continue to be able to apply and equality criteria are included in grant applications. It is considered that this saving is unlikely to have significant impact on any equality group.	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>)	
No rural impact	
With a reduction in each Ward's grant of £6,620 over 4 years and still £48,580 available in each ward, as well as other potential discretionary funding, any negative impacts can be minimised.	

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Corporate Communications		
Savings Name	Corporate Communications		
Budget (£m)	£0.150m	Staffing (FTE)	5.6

Reference CEO/5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Income generation:

1. The graphic design charge has not been reviewed or raised from £50p/h per hour since 2007. The proposal is therefore to raise the charge for any future work to £60p/h. This rise of 20% could generate an additional £4,000 if income remains at around £20,000 p/a. (with a further annual rise of a min 2.5% p/a)
2. Advertising on external newsletter "Highpoints" could generate at least £4,000 p/a.
3. Income from on-line video channel "Humans of Highland Council" to be scoped. This could assist THC in getting out information and showing all that the Council does, whilst providing additional income generated per views.
4. Some of the Common Good Fund graphic design is done by SPP and this should be brought in house as far as possible

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.006	
2016/17	0.001	
2017/18	0.001	
2018/19	0.001	
Aggregate	0.009	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

The suggested income generation contributes to projects which help to deliver and communicate the council programme

Deliverability and Risks

The suggested income generation is deliverable, however if the graphic design income levels fall, then the estimated income from the increase in charges will also fall.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact. This proposes slightly higher charges for graphic design; this will not have any equality impact.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>)	
No rural impact. This proposes slightly higher charges for graphic design; this will not have any rural impact.	

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Corporate Leadership Support		
Savings Name	Reduction in Staffing Budget		
Budget (£m)	£0.788m	Staffing (FTE)	7.3

Reference CEO/6

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

To remove 0.5fte at Grade HC09 – a post that became vacant on 31 October 2014.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	0.5
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	0.5

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There will be no adverse impact on the Council's programme.

Deliverability and Risks

This is readily deliverable

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Corporate Leadership Support		
Savings Name	Reduction in Discretionary Budgets		
Budget (£m)	£0.788m	Staffing (FTE)	7.3

Reference CEO/7

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

To reduce the Chief Executive's discretionary grants budget by £10.5k which will reduce the current annual budget from £0.047m to £0.036m.

To remove a £20k budget on payments to external contractors which is no longer required. In previous years this budget has been used to support legal costs relating to Health & Social Care Integration and HQ improvements.

To reduce a range of budgets for telephony, conference and miscellaneous supplies, totalling £4k.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.034	
2016/17	0.005	
2017/18	0.005	
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.044	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There will be no adverse impact on the Council's programme.

Deliverability and Risks

This is readily deliverable

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Reference	CEO/8
Activity Heading	Members' Budget				
Savings Name	Members' Budget				
Budget (£m)	£2.193m	Staffing (FTE)	2.4 + 80 councillors		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduce Members' budget by £20k in 2015/16 through the following measures :

	£
Delete remaining budget from vacant post	8,500
Cease provision of newspapers on committee days	500
Reduce telephone budget	2,000
Reduce training budget	3,000
Delete conference budget	1,000
Reduce Members' catering budget	5,000
	20,000

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	0.5
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	0.5

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There will be no adverse impact on the Council's programme.

Deliverability and Risks

No issues with deliverability or risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Cross Service		
Savings Name	Vacancy Management		
Budget (£m)	£6.923m	Staffing (FTE)	42.8

Reference CEO/9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This is a one off saving, to capture the savings made on vacancies in 2015/16 across the Chief Executive's Office as a whole, to bridge the savings gap for year 1. In future years, 2016/17 to 2018/19, the Chief Executive's Office is able to offer up savings amounting to more than the 2% required, which will be permanent, and will offset the £10,000 gap from 2015/16.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.010	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.010	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There will be no adverse impact on the Council's programme.

Deliverability and Risks

This is deliverable. An analysis of turn over in previous years suggests that vacancies could be managed to ensure a gap between one employee leaving and another starting to provide sufficient underspend to give up £10k as a one off saving in year 1.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Policy & Reform		
Savings Name	Operational Management		
Budget (£m)	£0.974m	Staffing (FTE)	17.0

Reference CEO/10

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduce the number of Ward Managers, or amend the structure to widen responsibility across multi-wards. This would require other services to pick up tasks seen as essential, and adversely impact on the Council's ability to transfer services to communities and other aspects of the new community empowerment legislation.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.060	1.0
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.060	1.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Principal impact on Programme under "Empower our Communities". A review of priorities for ward management and how best to deliver these should avoid any potential adverse impact on allowing communities to develop proposals for greater community ownership and local delivery of services.

Deliverability and Risks

The saving is achievable, but it could not be achieved through staff turnover. A reduction of more than 1 FTE is possible, but with an increase in the level of risk identified above. The priorities for ward management are being reviewed so that the Council can respond well to the community empowerment legislation. Flexibility in how to identify the savings is needed.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

This is a proposal to potentially reduce the number of ward managers or amend the structure to widen responsibility across multi-wards. This is not considered to impact on equality groups.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

This is a proposal to potentially reduce the number of ward managers or amend the structure to widen responsibility across multi-wards. With a review of priorities for ward management underway there is no evidence that this would impact negatively on rural areas.

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Staffing		
Savings Name	Staffing		
Budget (£m)	£8.37m	Staffing (FTE)	238.9

Reference CD/1

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Staffing accounts for 45% of Corporate Development (CDV) budget and in order to achieve the required reduction in budget it will be necessary to reduce the FTE by a further 20 over 2015/19. This will be achieved through removing vacant posts, when they arise, and restructuring after planned retirements. This will reduce the capacity to deliver services and support within the Council and will mean that limited resources will have to be prioritised and not all demand for services will be met in relation to HR, Legal, Democratic Services and ICT.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.170	6
2016/17	0.143	5
2017/18	0.143	5
2018/19	0.143	4
Aggregate	0.599	20

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

It will be necessary to prioritise statutory work e.g. legal services, which may result in support not being available for non-statutory services, even if they are within the Council Programme.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving can be delivered.

Risks:

- reduced capacity within services and therefore the delayed or non-delivery of work which is non-statutory yet may still be a council commitment
- external professional advice may be required if internal resource is not available

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Staff impact

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required)

Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Miscellaneous Budgets		
Savings Name	Miscellaneous Budgets		
Budget (£m)	£0.050	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference CD/2

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Analysis of the budget has identified a number of codes which, in previous years, have usually been under-spent. It is proposed to remove or reduce these budget codes which includes:

- Furniture
- Equipment
- Stationery
- Catering

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.050	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.050	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable no risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Travel & Subsistence		
Savings Name	Travel & Subsistence		
Budget (£m)	£0.171m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference CD/3

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Further reductions in staff travel and subsistence budgets. There should be no impact on service delivery given the improvements in technology and the ability for staff to use video and tele conferencing to participate in meetings rather than always travelling. Introduction of Unified Communications will further improve access to desk-top video conferencing.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.035	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.035	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable no risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	ICT		
Savings Name	ICT Efficiency		
Budget (£m)	£10.2m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference CD/4

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

- Reduction in Service Level Agreement with Fujitsu Service Desk, allowing longer period of time for calls to be answered
- Switching ICT users to On-line password reset (avoiding more expensive call handling by the Service Desk)
- Introduction of Webchat on the Service Desk (avoiding more expensive call handling by the Service Desk)

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.100	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.100	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable no risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Advertising		
Savings Name	Advertising		
Budget (£m)	£0.040m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference CD/5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduce advertising budget. This relates to advertising job vacancies. However this is now all done on-line via the MyJobScotland website and 97% of applications are received on-line.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.025	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.025	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable no risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Various Budgets		
Savings Name	Remove Un-Used Budgets		
Budget (£m)	£0.155m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference CD/6

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

In order to achieve the savings target the Service will have to find a further £120,000 savings in 2015/16 and this will be done by removing some unused budgets.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.120	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.120	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable no evident risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Customer Services		
Savings Name	Customer Services		
Budget (£m)	£2.070m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference CD/7

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Customer Services Review Board is currently reviewing arrangements for Service Points and has a target to achieve £160,000 savings from the review. The original target, already built into the budget is £100,000. The additional £60,000 saving is therefore to be included in the budget.

NB this does not change the overall net savings target for customer services which will remain at £160,000 and the impact on staffing is up to 19 posts, approximately 8 FTE.

The delivery of savings is dependent on the results of the current review.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.060	3
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.060	3

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Positive impact in relation to modernising service delivery and moving more services on-line. Will impact on rural communities where service delivery model would change.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable but there are risks that some people within the community will find it more difficult to access services due to the changes.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Questions were asked about the approach to the Customer Services Review as part of the Budget Consultation process. These findings will be considered alongside the results from the specific consultation on the Customer Services Review once complete.

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Full impact assessment required (as part of CSR)

Customers may need to access services differently and the current proposal is out for consultation which includes measures to mitigate the impact on customers who prefer face-to-face contact. An equality impact assessment is being undertaken as part of the Customer Services Review.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1. No impact

2. **Some impact identified**

3. Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required)

Potential rural impact – further consideration required Impact on rural communities where service delivery would change. The current proposal is out for consultation which includes measures to mitigate the impact on rural communities. An rural impact assessment is being undertaken as part of the Customer Services Review

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Unified Communications		
Savings Name	Unified Communications		
Budget (£m)	£1.060m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference CD/8

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Resources Committee has already agreed to implement a new Unified Communications solution in corporate offices (this will replace our current telephony system and implement desk-top video conferencing etc). Savings will be achieved from reduction in rentals for multiple telephone lines and support/maintenance costs.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.300	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.300	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Positive impact in that it improves efficiency and offers more opportunities for mobile & flexible working, reduced travel costs and reduction in carbon emissions.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable no risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> <i>(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)</i>	

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i>	

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	ICT		
Savings Name	ICT		
Budget (£m)	£10.2 m	Staffing (FTE)	29 (ICT Service)

Reference CD/9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Further reduction in ICT budget, involving further reductions in service levels in corporate and curriculum

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.100	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.100	N/A*Fujitsu staff reductions

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None directly, however the provision of an efficient and effective ICT Service enables the delivery of services and several council commitments.

Deliverability and Risks

The saving is deliverable but would result in lower service levels and a potential reduction in staffing by the council's current ICT provider.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Negative impact but mitigation identified if services prioritised focus on ICT services that support people with protected characteristics, eg welfare benefits, supplier payments.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Conditional - Negative impact but mitigation identified – depending on what is prioritised as mitigation

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Employability		
Savings Name	Efficiency from Employability Service Budget		
Budget (£m)	£2.182m	Staffing (FTE)	16

Reference D&I/1

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Efficiency saving by taking the opportunity to access EU funds to mitigate the reduction in direct Council funding. Minimal implications for service provision.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.230	
2016/17	0.050	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.280	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None. Employability Services delivered more efficiently.

Deliverability and Risks

Easily delivered by Service. Risks minimal and manageable.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

55% of the Citizens' Panel reported that this proposal **would make no difference** to them and their family.

48% of the Citizens' Panel reported that this proposal **may be a helpful change** or **a change for the better** for the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

52% of groups reported that this change **would make no difference** to their group or organisation.

39% indicated that it **may be a helpful change** or **a change for the better** for the wider community.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

43% of respondents noted that this proposal **would make no difference** to them or their family.

38% reported that it **may be a helpful change** or **a change for the better** for the wider community however a quarter of respondents did note that it **could cause some difficulty**.

Equalities

Concern was expressed by some of the participants from the focus groups about their current access to employability services. It was felt that there was a need to focus beyond the long term unemployed in specific geographical locations and include those disadvantaged because of their disabilities (learning disability, visual impairment, etc.). In this context enabling these groups to access meaningful employment (and volunteering opportunities) to help them to overcome isolation and to earn a decent income was emphasised as equally important as the focus on the long term unemployed in specific geographical areas.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

http://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/download/404/equality_impact_assessments

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Further information required about the potential for rural impact, and identify whether it is at this stage or in the delivery of the new programme.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Reference	D&I/2
Activity Heading	Across all Heads				
Savings Name	Vacancy Management				
Budget (£m)	£17.973m	Staffing (FTE)	424		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Management of vacancies that arise naturally across all parts of the D&I Service. Implications are that the work carried out by staff vacating post will be reviewed and reallocated to remaining staff. Managers to manage vacancies efficiently in line with Council Programme proprieties.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.235	6.6
2016/17	0.100	2.8
2017/18	0.100	2.8
2018/19	0.100	2.8
Aggregate	0.535	15.00

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None. The review and reallocation of workload will focus on Council priorities.

Deliverability and Risks

Depends on posts becoming vacant within service. Risks are that post do not become available within timeframes required. Higher risk in early years of proposal (15/16). Average staff turnover rates (estimated 5%) indicate this proposal is achievable.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Negative impact but mitigation identified – the service is predominantly male, especially at senior level, however any vacancies will be managed across the services as they arise through natural wastage and in line with Council policy.

Staff Impact

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Rural impact not known – would need monitored and assessed at later stage

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Planning and Building Standards		
Savings Name	Planning and Building Standards Fees		
Budget (£m)	£4.188m (Fee Income)	Staffing (FTE)	89

Reference D&I/3

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increased income to offset saving requirements. Increasing income via fees and charges. Scottish Government has agreed 5% increase in planning fees from October 2014.

Fee income is derived from Planning and Building Standards activity, which reflects the growing economy. Economic activity and construction application/consents are anticipated to rise.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.130	
2016/17	0.025	
2017/18	0.025	
2018/19	0.025	
Aggregate	0.205	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable given anticipated fee income increase (5%).

Risk would be of failure to meet income target as a result of limited economic growth.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact – The increase in fees is set nationally. This proposal is about change of process and investment and will not affect equality groups.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact – fees are received centrally and are not allocated by area.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Project Design Unit		
Savings Name	Fee Income		
Budget (£m)	£19.975m (Capital)	Staffing (FTE)	60

Reference D&I/4

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increased fee income to PDU from internal client services.

The implication of this saving is that the Service uses less external consultancy. As a result there may be pressure on the delivery of the Capital Programme as less external resource can be bought in to assist its delivery. The Service will provide opportunities to increase the level of in-house staff to deliver the Capital Programme directly rather than relying on external support.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.125	
2016/17	0.010	
2017/18	0.010	
2018/19	0.005	
Aggregate	0.150	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Proposal may affect the ability to deliver the Capital Programme within timescales

Deliverability and Risks

Risks are limited availability of staff available for recruitment and that Capital Programme slippage is experienced in the short term. This does however provide the opportunity to create additional Council jobs.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – This proposes less use of external consultancy, there is no equality impact identified for any particular group. There may be some positive impact on the employment, for example of graduate,

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

There may be positive rural impact identified, depending on where posts are located.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Property		
Savings Name	Fee Income		
Budget (£m)	£13.665m (Capital)	Staffing (FTE)	51

Reference D&I/5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduce consultancy expenditure.

The implication of this saving is that the Service uses less external consultancy. As a result there may be pressure on the delivery of the Capital Programme as less external resource can be bought in to assist its delivery. The Service will provide opportunities to increase the level of in-house staff to deliver the Capital Programme directly rather than relying on external support.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.430	
2016/17	0.070	
2017/18	0.070	
2018/19	0.070	
Aggregate	0.640	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Risks are limited availability of staff available for recruitment and that Capital Programme slippage is experienced in the short term. This does however provide the opportunity to create additional Council jobs..

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact identified in this proposal to use less external consultancy

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact identified in this proposal to use less external consultancy

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Housing Development		
Savings Name	Industrial Development Charges		
Budget (£m)	Combined £0.428m (Income Generated)	Staffing (FTE)	12

Reference D&I/6

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*
 Rental income will be increased from the industrial development/property portfolio.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.070	
2016/17	0.026	
2017/18	0.027	
2018/19	0.027	
Aggregate	0.150	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

The proposed rental increase can be delivered as proposed.
 Risks associated with this proposal are limited. Insignificant financial impact on businesses renting Council property.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact identified – this is a proposal for rental increases to be gathered across the property portfolio.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Project Design Unit		
Savings Name	Materials Testing Fees		
Budget (£m)	Combined £0.276m (Fee Income)	Staffing (FTE)	60

Reference D&I/7

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Proposal is to increase material testing fees generated via the Council material testing laboratory. There will be no service delivery implications.

Additional charges will be made material testing for clients. There will be no significant impact on material testing workload.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.025	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.025	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Increases charges proposed can be allocated relatively easily.
There are no risks attached to this relatively small increase in charges.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact identified – this is a proposal is about increasing the fee charges for material testing and will not affect equality groups.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact – this is used primarily for larger construction companies and is not likely to impact on small rural business.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Housing Development		
Savings Name	Housing Development Charges		
Budget (£m)	Combined £0.428m (Income Generated)	Staffing (FTE)	12

Reference D&I/8

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Proposal is to increase housing development charges. There will be no significant service delivery implications.

Additional charges will be made to HRA Capital Programme. There will be no significant impact on Housing Revenue collected from Council tenants.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Increases charges proposed can be allocated to capital housing project easily.
There is no risk attached to the relatively small additional charges proposed.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact identified – this is a proposal is about internal re-charges, there will be no significant service delivery implications and no impact on tenants as this is a process adjustment.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

As above – No rural impact identified

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Reference	D&I/9
Activity Heading	Business Gateway Service (HOL)				
Savings Name	Reduce contribution to Highland Opportunity Ltd				
Budget (£m)	Combined £0.644m (Income)	Staffing (FTE)	15.5		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Proposal is to reduce the payment made to Highland Opportunity Ltd for the delivery of the Business Gateway Service during 2015/16 by £45K (from a current level of £644K).

Implications for service delivery are not significant. Experience in managing the BG contract and budget efficiencies identified during 2012/13 - 2014/15 will be incorporated into new contract commencing April 2015.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.045	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.045	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None. Provision of specialist business and recruitment advice will continue to be available throughout Highland.

Deliverability and Risks

Easily delivered saving as the payment made is discretionary.

There is a small risk that the BG services available to small businesses will be slightly reduced. But this is unlikely as the economy improves. Future services should be targeted where demand is greatest.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Negative impact but mitigation identified

There is no evidence that any equality group is likely to be more affected by this proposal – services are available to all aspiring small and start-up businesses across the Highlands. This is a discretionary payment and the anticipated impact is slight. Additionally impact can be minimised by targeting services and potentially seeking other sources of funding.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

As before – No rural impact identified, but this may depend on where future services are targeted and targeting may require a rural impact assessment

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Reference	D&I/10
Activity Heading	Visit Scotland				
Savings Name	Reduce Contribution to Grant				
Budget (£m)	Combined £0.225m (grant payment)	Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Proposal is to reduce the grant payment made to Visit Scotland for the delivery of the tourism services in Highland. Reduced to £150K in 15/16 from £225K in 14/15.

Grant supports regional marketing activity in Highland only and the VIC network including in strategic centres in Inverness, Fort William, Aviemore, Portree, Thurso, Ullapool and Fort Augustus.

There are limited implications for service delivery as the Council's relationship with VS is under review at present. VS role nationally is also under review and it is recognised that there are now quickly changing and modernising means of promoting tourism nationally.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.075	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.075	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None. Provision of support for VS will remain at a reduced level and future activity will focus on new ways of promoting tourism in the Highlands.

Deliverability and Risks

Easily delivered as financial support is discretionary.

Risk allied to this proposal is that there may eventually be reduced TIC coverage in some areas of the Highlands.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – this affects the promotion of services, it may result in the reduced needs for TICs in some areas but the focus will be on more modern means of promoting tourism in the Highlands and where demand for TICs remains greatest. Information on accessible tourism is already available on-line.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Other – under development – rural impact is unknown at present as Visit Scotland would need to make decisions.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Environment		
Savings Name	Access & Ranger Budget		
Budget (£m)	£1.746m	Staffing (FTE)	35.5

Reference D&I/11

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduce the level of discretionary spend on Access projects (£40K). Implications are that there will be less funding available in the Access projects budget for spend on core paths and community access projects.

Reduce seasonal staffing currently required to cover ranger activities and sites (£48K).

Increased ranger and long distance route income resulting from events programme and merchandising (£3k).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.091	1.6
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.091	1.6

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Proposed savings can be delivered in 2015/16.

Risks are a slightly reduced service and reduction in maintenance of paths, and facilities during the summer months.

Risk might be increased charges reduce participation in events.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Negative impact but mitigation identified

This proposal will reduce the availability of access funding for projects which have included developments and

improvements to 'paths for all' access which have benefited those with limited mobility, in particular disabled people and older people. There will also be reduced seasonal staff to cover ranger activities and sites. Mitigating action will include seeking alternative sources of funding to support projects. There will also be a review and re-organisation of ranger activities to ensure the maintenance of staff cover at key sites and for desired activities. There may also be an opportunity to explore the transfer of some activities to community organisations.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Negative impact but mitigation identified

Mitigating action will include seeking alternative sources of funding to support projects. There will also be a review and re-organisation of ranger activities to ensure the maintenance of staff cover at key sites and for desired activities. There may also be an opportunity to explore the transfer of some activities to community organisations.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Various		
Savings Name	Efficiencies Across Budgets		
Budget (£m)	£18.553m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference D&I/12

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*
Reduction in uncommitted discretionary spend across the Service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.115	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.115	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Can be delivered within timescale. Risk is that the project does not identify the £115K anticipated. Shortfall will then be required from elsewhere.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact – the amount specified will come from across the service and will not impact on customers or staff.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact – the amount specified will come from across the service and will not impact on customers or staff.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Environment & Economic Development		
Savings Name	Allocate Staff Costs to Capital		
Budget (£m)	£1.286m (project value)	Staffing (FTE)	5.5

Reference D&I/13

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Proposal is to allocate legitimate staff costs to the Capital Programme based on the projects undertaken. There will be no implications for service delivery. Staff will not be lost to the Service at the end of projects. They will continue to work on capital projects that the Service is responsible for via future Capital Programmes.

Staff costs will be offset against the Capital Programme.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.120	0.0
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.120	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Can be delivered in 2015/16.

Risk may be the reduction in Capital Programme values in the longer term which may limit project funding available.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact – This is an administrative process of internal cost reallocation and there is no staff or customer impact.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact – This is an administrative process of internal cost reallocation and there is no staff or customer impact.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Environment & Economic Development		
Savings Name	Transfer of Glen Nevis Centre		
Budget (£m)	£0.005m (Net of income)	Staffing (FTE)	3

Reference D&I/14

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Transfer of Glen Nevis Visitor Centre to HLH.

Operation of the VC will be undertaken by HLH.

There should be no implications for service delivery activity and staff will transfer to HLH via agreement with the Council.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.017	3
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.017	3

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable by 15/16 if work starts early. Risk is that TUPE considerations and negotiations with unions delay the process and limit the saving realised.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact anticipated as the service should continue as at present. TUPE regulations would apply to staff and therefore continuity of T&Cs.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Positive impact identified,

No negative rural impact as the facility will continue to operate under HLH and this should be a positive impact for the area

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Community Service Integration		
Savings Name	Service Restructure (predominantly at Area level)		
Budget (£m)	£62.587m	Staffing (FTE)	1,259

Reference CS/1

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The merger of TECS and Housing and Property to form Community Services has resulted in savings predominantly at area management level (one post already removed at HC15 and two posts at HC11). Work is on-going that will see two further posts (currently vacant) not being filled as part of wider restructuring within the Service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.295	5
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.295	5

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

There are no risks to the deliverability of this saving in 2015/16

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – no change to front line delivery. These are management savings with minimal impact on front-line service delivery and no impact on particular staff groups/customer groups.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact – as above.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Grounds Maintenance		
Savings Name	Save on Contractor Costs		
Budget (£m)	£2.571m	Staffing (FTE)	116.8

Reference CS/2

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Critically review and update existing work programmes for grounds maintenance to reduce costs but still deliver acceptable standards and a uniform standard per asset type in all areas.
 Prioritise key sites within affordability limits and following feedback from the budget consultation process
 Minimise the use of seasonal staff by the DLO.
 Proactively work with community groups to develop opportunities to transfer work to them.
 Bowling greens: promote transfer of work to contractor or clubs
 Review contract requirements for 2016/17 onwards; type of contract and specification; consider including routine winter grounds work.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.067	2.5
2016/17	0.063	0.5
2017/18	0.040	0.5
2018/19	0.040	0.5
Aggregate	0.210	4.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Increase in retender prices above budget (for 2016/17–18/19) – review contract type to reduce risk.
 Feedback is sought from the public and the proposals form part of the budget consultation process.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

32% of the Panel reported that this proposal was **a change that could be coped with** and 31% that it **would make no difference** to them or their family. 38% of the Panel indicated it was **a change that could be coped with** for the wider community and 27% that it **could cause some difficulty**.

Communities Panel – community groups

A similar response was received from the Communities Panel with 39% reporting that it **would make no difference** to their group and a further 27% that it was **a change that could be coped with**. Whilst 37% of respondents indicated that it was **a change that could be coped with** by the wider community, a third believed that it **could cause some difficulty**.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

39% of respondents to the web survey reported that the proposal was **a change that could be coped with** by them and their family and 42% was that it was **a change that could be coped with** by the wider community.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

No equality impact – the proposal will still deliver services to an acceptable standard and there are no anticipated impacts on any particular equality group.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Negative impact is possible in small rural areas where seasonal grass cutting work was formerly available.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Increase Income		
Savings Name	Increase Income – applications and inspections		
Budget (£m)	£0.237m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference CS/4

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increase income from applications and inspections – functions carried out by roads inspectors.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.010	
2016/17	0.010	
2017/18	0.010	
2018/19	0.010	
Aggregate	0.040	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Difficult to influence increased income from applications as this is dependent on the state of the economy.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Emergency Planning		
Savings Name	Charge for the preparation of Contingency Plans		
Budget (£m)	£0.199m	Staffing (FTE)	4

Reference CS/5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Under statutory regulations (COMAH & REPPiR), the Council must prepare off-site, multi-agency, and emergency response plans for a number of fixed chemical and radiological sites (e.g. Alcan, Dounreay). There are 7 sites in total. The plans are written and reviewed by members of the Emergency Planning Unit on a cycle generally extending to 3 years. They are scrutinised by respective regulators; e.g. Office for Nuclear Regulation, HSE.

The proposal is that the Council charges the site operators for the work involved in preparing these off-site plans.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.005	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.005	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

There may be an impact on the multi-agency working relationships that currently exist as these plans are not charged for by other Local Authorities.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Environmental Health		
Savings Name	Cut down on mail shots		
Budget (£m)	£0.005m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference CS/6

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Environmental Health to cut down on hard copy mail shots and use e-mail as much as possible. Team will improve email contacts with business. Will have no negative impact on stakeholders.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.002	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.002	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

No significant issues in deliverability. No significant risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Burials and Cremations		
Savings Name	Increase Interment Charges		
Budget (£m)	£0.990m	Staffing (FTE)	116.8

Reference CS/7a

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increase Interment charges by 10% pa for 4 years

Assuming that other Council's rates increase by 2.5% pa the proposal would be:

- to increase interment charges to Scottish average rate in 15/16;
- to top quartile of Scotland in 16/17; and
- to 5th place in years 17/18 – 18/19.

THC currently charges £505 for an interment and this would rise to £740 by year 4 (2018/19)

There are approximately 1,000 burials per annum.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.083	
2016/17	0.091	
2017/18	0.100	
2018/19	0.110	
Aggregate	0.384	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Risk that a proportion of the population will find the increase difficult to pay.

Consultation feedback, Equalities & Rural Impact

See CS 7d

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Burials and Cremations		
Savings Name	Increase Interment charges		
Budget (£m)	£0.990m	Staffing (FTE)	116.8

Reference CS/7b

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increase Interment charges

Increase interment charges to equal cremation charges in year 1 and add 5% pa thereafter. This is additional to the "Increase Interment Charges" proposal ref CS/7a.

THC currently charges £505 for an interment and this would rise to £775 by year 4 (2018/19).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.125	
2016/17	0.046	
2017/18	0.050	
2018/19	0.055	
Aggregate	0.276	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Risk that a relatively small proportion of the population will find the increase difficult to pay.

Consultation feedback, Equalities & Rural Impact

See CS 7d

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Burials and Cremations		
Savings Name	Increase Cremation charges		
Budget (£m)	£0.990m	Staffing (FTE)	116.8

Reference CS/7c

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increase Cremation charges by 10% pa for 4 years

Assuming that other Council's rates increase by 2.5% pa the proposal would be:

- to increase cremation charges to Scottish average rate in 15/16;
- then to top quartile of Scotland in 16/17;
- to 4th place in 17/18; and
- to =3rd in 18/19.

THC currently charges £580 for a cremation and this would rise to £850 by year 4 (2018/19)

There are approximately 1,000 cremations per annum.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.058	
2016/17	0.064	
2017/18	0.070	
2018/19	0.077	
Aggregate	0.269	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Risk that a relatively small proportion of the population will find the increase difficult to pay.

Consultation feedback, Equalities & Rural Impact

See CS 7d

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Burials and Cremations		
Savings Name	Increase Lair Purchase		
Budget (£m)	£0.990m	Staffing (FTE)	116.8

Reference CS/7d

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increase Lair Purchase charges by 12% in year 1 and 10% pa for the next 3 years

Assuming that other Council's rates increase by 2.5% pa the proposal would:

- Increase lair charges to Scottish average rate in 15/16; and
- then to top quartile of Scotland in 16/17 – 18/19

THC currently charges £479 for a single lair and this would rise to £715 by year 4 (2018/19)

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.095	
2016/17	0.087	
2017/18	0.096	
2018/19	0.105	
Aggregate	0.383	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Risk that a relatively small proportion of the population will find the increase difficult to pay.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

41% of Panel respondents indicated the increase in charges to around the Scottish average was **a change that could be coped with** for them or their family.

44% of respondents believed that the increase **could cause some difficulty** for the wider community however third reported that it was **a change that could be coped with**.

Respondents were more concerned at the potential impact of increasing the charges to above the Scottish average. 40% indicating this **could cause some difficulty** to them and **66%** to the wider community. This was one of the highest ranked proposals for **could cause some difficulty** for the Citizens' Panel.

The majority of respondents reported that increasing burial charges above those of cremation would either make no difference, that it would be a positive change or a change that could be coped with. A similar response was received for the impact on the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

Around **60%** of groups reported that the increase in burial, cremation and lair charges either *up to or above* the

Scottish average **would make no difference** to their group. Respondents were divided on the impact to the wider community of increasing charges to around the Scottish average with **46%** indicating the change was one **that could be coped with** and **39%** that it **could cause some difficulty**. 68% of groups indicated the proposal to increase charges above the Scottish average **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community.

The majority of groups reported that the proposed change to burial charges above cremation charges would **make no difference** to their group. Respondents were divided on the potential impact on the wider community with **37%** reporting it was a **change that could be coped with** but **36%** that it **could cause some difficulty**.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

42% of respondents reported that increasing charges to around the Scottish average was a **change that could be coped with** by their family but 41% said that it **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community. Respondents were more likely to indicate that the proposal to increase charges *above* the Scottish average **could cause some difficulty** both to them and to the wider community.

Respondents to the web survey were divided about the potential impact of increase burial charges above those of cremation both to them as individuals and to the wider community.

Equalities

Respondents with a disability were slightly more likely, across the Citizens Panel and Website survey, to indicate the proposals around internment charges **could cause some difficulty**. This concern was also expressed by individuals with disabilities participating in the focus groups.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Negative impact possible, any potential impact as a result of religion/belief would need to be monitored, however, the increase in fees is not disproportionate compared to other local authority areas.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Negative impact – there may be some rural impact as a result of higher costs, rural communities have only the option of Inverness in Highland for cremation services and travel costs already increase costs for families from rural areas who choose this option.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Cyclical Road Maintenance		
Savings Name	Verge Cutting		
Budget (£m)	£1.239m	Staffing (FTE)	221

Reference CS/9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Verge Cutting – Reduction in the length and frequency of cutting roadside verges. Verge cutting only for the purpose of improving road junctions, visibility splays, bad bends (with an accident history) and road signage. Road verges will be cut back once per year at the end of the season to ensure there is no excessive shrub/ tree regeneration.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.150	2
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.150	2

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact
Will provide links to green policies and wildlife corridors

Deliverability and Risks

Good publicity required to inform the public. Safety is key concern

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

Around 40% of Panel respondents indicated the change in verge cutting could be **a change for the better** or **may be a helpful change** to both them and the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

40% of groups reported that this proposal **would make no difference** to their group. However groups were divided about the impact on the wider community including a third indicating it **could cause some difficulty**.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

Respondents were divided about the potential impact both on them and the wider community of verge cutting.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>) No impact – no equality impact identified in this proposal.	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) No rural impact identified – however, there may be opportunities for communities to help provide the service which could have a potentially positive impact in rural areas.	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Housing Support Services		
Savings Name	Re-tender of Support Services		
Budget (£m)	£1.822m	Staffing (FTE)	4

Reference

CS/10

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Housing support services for homeless or potentially homeless clients are currently delivered through contracts with 8 independent support providers and an in-house service. This saving comes from making a change from the current top rates paid to independent support providers down to an average of £17.50 per hour; this will see some providers' rates increase and others decrease, however further discussion will take place with providers aimed at mitigating any impact on them and identifying any unique challenges any of the providers faces. In addition there will be a reduction of 2 posts within the in-house team and changes to the way services are provided to Cairn Housing Association's Flora MacDonald House.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.124	2
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.124	2

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

In delivering our duty to provide housing support services we meet the Council's commitment to reduce poverty and prevent homelessness. This is achieved through effective advice, support and benefit uptake. This proposal may impact on our commitment to prioritise and support jobs in the Highlands and promote a living wage.

Deliverability and Risks

Under the current contract requirements, we are legally required to give 13 weeks' notice of any variation to the existing conditions of contract. Issuing the required notice period would allow budget savings to be achieved during 2014/2015.

This proposal reduces the income to Housing Support providers. This may impact on the long-term viability/ sustainability of the housing support services that they provide. This presents a risk to the Council through not being able to meet our duty to provide a housing support service to those that are homeless or potentially homeless.

Consultation feedback

Summary

A separate consultation was undertaken with Housing Support Providers regarding this proposal. Key points noted include:

- All Providers felt that they would be unable to deliver a quality Housing Support service on the proposed rate of £15 per hour, with most expressing concern as to the quality of service and outcomes that could be achieved from implementing a standard rate of £15 per hour.
- All expressed the view that investment in this service reduces increased costs to the Council in respect of Service Users further down the line. For example, in relation to tenancy sustainment, rent arrears prevention, homelessness and anti-social behaviour.
- Concern was expressed by some of the Providers that the proposed savings would impact on the overall viability of the services they provide
- Some expressed concern that staff retention could prove to be problematic if funding is cut.
- All Providers expressed concern that a reduced hourly rate would present difficulties in meeting the requirements of the Care Inspectorate, and may impact on their Care Grading.
- All Providers expressed concern that a reduced hourly rate would present difficulties in meeting the

requirements of the Care Inspectorate, and may impact on their Care Grading.

- Most providers pointed to the continuing high demand for Housing Support Services, with some Providers operating waiting lists.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

Full impact assessment summary. The proposal is to introduce a standard hourly rate for the providers of short term housing support to homeless and potentially homeless people. There is possible negative impact if hours/quality are reduced, however this would be mitigated by improvements in quality of service.

The budget saving proposal aims to reduce the amount we pay for homeless support services, while retaining the current number of hours and the quality of that service.

We currently gather information on the number of people who approach us as homeless (241 last year) and we can determine the ethnicity of this group (mainly White Scottish and Other White (anecdotally mostly eastern European). however, we cannot determine the ethnicity or gender of those actually in homeless accommodation (the group the support is mainly aimed at) although we do have their ages. the support is also aimed at people who are threatened with homelessness and we have less information about this group, until they actually become homeless. We have a new system for logging support assessments and the data gathered is currently flawed.

Several mitigation actions are being taken:

- Keeping providers informed and on board with the budget savings - meetings have already taken place.
- If any providers withdraw, we will procure services to replace them at the same service provision specification
- Ongoing communication with providers to support them in retaining/achieving the required care inspectorate standards and support in reviewing current structures and processes to allow more efficient delivery of services;
- If the service is to be reduced, we will ensure that all clients receive information relevant to their circumstances, with face to face communication for young people and translation services provided where necessary; this is a staffing issue - staff are not exclusively of the same age/gender so no equality issue - and the budget saving is dependent on this happening where a local provider withdraws, we will procure a similar service from the existing/new providers.
- Apart from the budget savings proposal, a wider review of housing support services has indicated the need for a Contract Monitoring post which will review and monitor all impacts across all groups.

http://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/download/404/equality_impact_assessments

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Potential impact on provision in rural areas (service could be widened to rural areas not receiving a service – if providers can do so with proposed funding).

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Travel		
Savings Name	Reduction in Staff Travel		
Budget (£m)	£0.236m	Staffing (FTE)	1,259

Reference CS/11

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduction in staff travel costs. This is additional to the Corporate Improvement Programme target.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

No risks

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Revision of Working Hours		
Savings Name	Reduction in Overtime		
Budget (£m)	£2.681m	Staffing (FTE)	1,259

Reference CS/12

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This saving is in two parts:

Part 1 – a straight 13% cut in the overtime budget (excluding HRA) in 2015/16. There are 18 separate overtime functions within the Service that will between them capture the proposed saving on a targeted basis.

Part 2 – a wider review of how the Service delivers some of its front-line functions leading to further savings in 2017/18 – 2018/19. This will include consideration of annualised hours; overtime; shift patterns; and enhanced hours provision. The Service has been doing some benchmarking with Argyll and Bute Council who have already introduced this. It took them two years to achieve this; hence the reason why the saving is later.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.347	
2016/17	0.000	
2017/18	0.100	
2018/19	0.100	
Aggregate	0.547	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There are no current impacts on the Council Programme

Deliverability and Risks

We are preparing a workforce that is available to deliver for an average winter and a reduced grounds maintenance contract with more input from communities. The real risk will be if we expect the same outputs from a reduced workforce. A harsh winter will still be dealt with by the Service but contingency funding will have to be found. In addition the grounds contract will have to be reduced or indeed removed in part; and with greater emphasis on community delivery.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No impact – no change in service provision and there would be no impact on equality groups.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact identified

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Vehicles		
Savings Name	Taking Vehicles Home		
Budget (£m)	£3.374m	Staffing (FTE)	1,259

Reference CS/14

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Current policy states that operational managers should sanction staff taking vehicles home by completing annual returns. The policy is currently being delivered on an ad hoc basis and will be monitored more rigorously going forward.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.050	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.050	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

No risks

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact – this proposal is to ensure Council policy is implemented and monitored and there would be no impact on equality groups

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact identified - this proposal is to ensure Council policy is implemented and monitored and there would be no impact.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Vehicles and Plant		
Savings Name	Vehicles and Plant Hire		
Budget (£m)	£2.711m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference CS/15

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Operational managers hire vehicles and plant to boost their assets according to seasonal and/or operational peaks of work and also to cover breakdown of priority front line items.

There is scope to make savings through improved and consistent management of the hire and off-hire process. It is proposed that the ability to hire co-ordinating role be introduced using existing staff to ensure that hires are necessary and that they are in place for the minimum of time.

Monitoring of plant, equipment and vehicle hires – a single database of hired plant and vehicles along with fleet plant and vehicles including non-fleet assets to be maintained with a single senior manager responsible for overall monitoring.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.100	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.100	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

With an efficient system in place using standard software the savings will be deliverable.

- Failure to keep the database up to date – low risk with management monitoring
- Non-availability of appropriate plant – low risk which may only occur during emergency response or high peaks in demand.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Street Cleansing		
Savings Name	Reduction of seasonal employment		
Budget (£m)	£3.411m	Staffing (FTE)	76.1

Reference CS/16

Savings Proposal

Stop employment of seasonal operatives in Ross & Cromarty. This would bring Ross & Cromarty in line with other areas. In the past these posts were used for holiday cover in street cleansing and other parts of the service, however this budget has not been used latterly and the proposed saving is simply a reduction in budget rather than a reduction in service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.030	1.5
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.030	1.5

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Saving proposal can be delivered with minimal impact to the service; however some reduction in street cleansing may occur due to lack of cover during holiday periods.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Disposal		
Saving Name	Disposal of Waste to Seater		
Budget (£m)	£11.958m	Staffing (FTE)	21

Reference CS/17

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Disposal of Sutherland Waste to Seater Landfill Site. Reduced contract transfer and disposal costs by using our own site.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.025	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.025	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

None

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Management		
Savings Name	Overtime payments to workforce		
Budget (£m)	£0.034m	Staffing (FTE)	13

Reference CS/18

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduced overtime payments to waste Forepersons – to be considered as part of wider saving on Service overtime.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.007	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.007	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Small risk to service delivery

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Recycling		
Savings Name	New Source of Income from Textiles		
Budget (£m)	£0.020m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference CS/19

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Discussion between THC and two out of the three textile collectors has yielded an offer of a standard income per tonne of textiles collected from named recycling points which are under the control of the THC (i.e. excludes those provided in supermarket sites). Agreement is based on one year's tonnage paid in arrears and claimed monthly. Previously all textile collectors provided the banks and serviced them free of charge although Blythswood Care has been supported for wider waste diversion activities through the social enterprise funding which includes textile recycling.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

The additional income is dependent on the market price for sales of textiles and will be reviewed annually. If the market price drops then the income will also drop or cease altogether, or textile banks will be withdrawn from service by the textile recycler. There is potential that the reduction in the social enterprise grant may also have a knock on effect as the groups dealing with textiles may not have the same capacity as before.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Disposal		
Savings Name	Remove flare stack at Granish landfill site		
Budget (£m)	£0.477m	Staffing (FTE)	3

Reference CS/20

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Remove flare stack at Granish landfill site. Previously there were two flares – there is now no need to pay a licence fee on the second one

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.012	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.012	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

None

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Service		
Savings Name	Reduce Miscellaneous Budgets		
Budget (£m)	£0.180m	Staffing (FTE)	1,259

Reference CS/22

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduction in miscellaneous budgets. By nature this budget line is discretionary. Any reduction in discretionary spend will not have a detrimental effect on service delivery.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.100	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.100	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

There is no effect on service delivery.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Lighting		
Savings Name	Street Lighting		
Budget (£m)	£4.030m	Staffing (FTE)	39

Reference CS/23

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Capital investment of £16.24m over 4 years to replace 46,400 streetlight lamp units with more efficient LED equivalent and requiring the replacement of some lighting columns that are near end of life anyway.
 Saving in energy estimated at 50% overall once all units are replaced.
 Reduced carbon usage linked to street lighting activities and associated CRC charges.
 Reduced fault reporting for streetlights through CRM.
 The savings are net of capital financing costs.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.128	
2016/17	0.128	
2017/18	0.128	
2018/19	0.129	
Aggregate	0.513	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Contributes to the reduction in use of Carbon.
 Improved quality of street lighting with good colour rendering and improved reliability.
 A reduction in light pollution attributed to street lighting.

Deliverability and Risks

Confidence in the amount of energy saved is high and is dependent on the Council keeping its inventory database up to date.
 Procurement of LED units through Scotland Excel will be in place in time to start this project.
 There is a risk that with the number of Local Authorities entering into the LED market throughout the UK on such a large scale may mean that supply will not be able to keep up with demand for the provision of street lighting LED lanterns.
 Due to the age and condition of the street lighting stock – columns/cablings etc. it is likely that a large scale LED programme will identify significant numbers of lighting columns which will have to be replaced before being fitted with LED lanterns.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)	

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i>	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Winter Maintenance		
Savings Name	Pre-treatment		
Budget (£m)	£5.494m	Staffing (FTE)	221

Reference CS/24a

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Winter Maintenance Service – setting of an overnight traffic flow threshold to determine which primary category roads do not receive a pre-cautionary evening treatment. The threshold being recommended is 20 vehicles between 9pm and 6am. Savings achieved will be through a reduction in overtime, fuel and salt.

Pre-cautionary treatment is only effective if a number of cars have driven over the salt.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.120	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.120	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Consultation with affected groups will be achieved through the budget consultation exercise.

There is a risk that treatment to roads starting at 6am may take more time through not providing a pre-cautionary treatment the previous evening.

There must be a positive PR campaign to ensure the public are made aware of the fact that a number of cars must have driven over the salt that has been laid down for it to have any effect.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

31% of respondents reported this was a change **that could be coped with** whilst a further 27% expressed that this **could cause some difficulty** to them or their family. 38% noted that the proposal could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but 30% reported that it was a change that **could be coped with**.

Communities Panel – community groups

Groups were divided on the potential impact of the proposal both on them with 38% indicating that it **could cause some difficulty** but 28% that it **would make no difference**. Just under half of groups reported that it **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community.

Some rural groups expressed specific concern about the impact on rural roads.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

Individuals responding to the website survey had similar views to the Communities Panel – divided on the impact upon them individually but just under half reporting that it **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> <i>(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)</i>	
No equality impact	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i>	
Negative impact but mitigation identified	
<p>Approximately 38% of the rural road network would be affected by reducing pre-treatment of roads in winter. This may adversely impact communities served by those roads but only during the overnight period. Mitigating action would be to increase publicity during adverse weather and raise awareness with the public that a certain number of cars need to drive over salt laid on roads to make it effective.</p>	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Winter Maintenance		
Savings Name	Treatment of 'Other' routes		
Budget (£m)	£5.494m	Staffing (FTE)	221

Reference CS/24b

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Winter Maintenance Service – provision of a more focussed delivery of the Winter Maintenance Policy. Targeting Primary and Secondary routes first and only moving to the lowest category “Other” routes when the first two priorities have been completed. This will result in a saving of 12 Lorries and Gritter bodies achieved over a 2 year period. Reduction in the number of staff in line with vehicles. No significant change required to Policy. Treatment of the highest two categories of road (Primary and Secondary routes) to remain unchanged.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.240	6
2016/17	0.240	6
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.480	12

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Consultation with affected groups will be achieved through the budget consultation exercise. There is a risk that some 'other' routes may not receive a treatment.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

55% of the Panel indicated that this proposal **could cause some difficulty** to them and 71% to the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

58% of groups noted this proposal **could cause some difficulty** to their group and 69% to the wider community.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

61% of respondents expressed that the proposal **could cause some difficulty** to them and 73% to the wider community.

Equalities

Participants in the Sight Impairment focus group expressed concern at the lack of snow clearing on pavements and roads which was particular important for their group. NHS Highland also noted the need to ensure roads and pavements around care homes and sheltered housing were given the same priority status as school.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> <i>(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)</i> There is potential for impact on care services affecting disabled people, older people and pregnant women and also the risks of isolation for some people, however 'blue light' arrangements are already in place. Increased publicity would be required during adverse weather.	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> No specific rural impact identified – both urban and rural roads would be affected (approximately 44% of the road network and may adversely impact on communities served by those roads.)	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Management		
Savings Name	Waste Management - Inverness		
Budget (£m)	£13.657m	Staffing (FTE)	244

Reference CS/25

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduce the number of refuse collection vehicles through improved routing efficiency (reduce refuse collection vehicle fleet in Inverness by 1 vehicle and 2 crew members).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.066	2
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.066	2

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Future population growth with reduced vehicle numbers will need to be carefully monitored.
Risk that workshops may not be able to put vehicles back into operation within a shorter timeframe

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – the number of refuse vehicles to be reduced through re-routing exercise with no change to service level, and staff losses accommodated through vacancy management.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Management		
Savings Name	Remove Separate Can and Paper Banks from Recycling Points		
Budget (£m)	£9.516m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference CS/27

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The collection of paper and cans from the recycling point network has reduced significantly since the introduction of the Alternate Weekly Collection Service (AWC) and the mandatory requirement for commercial businesses to recycle their waste. 550 tonnes of paper and cans were collected in 13/14 but when comparing the same period this current financial year with the same period in 13/14, there has been a reduction of 66% in the tonnage. There has also been a marked reduction in the quality of the paper collected in the paper banks. Most of the paper collected now requires to be directed through the co-mingled route rather than receiving an income for good quality paper. An additional cost for processing is therefore incurred.

It is proposed that the current contract for collection of materials from the can and paper banks at the recycling points are terminated and the recycling banks for same removed. There will be no change to the glass recycling banks.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.175	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.175	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There may be an impact on the agreed recycling rate within the Programme

Deliverability and Risks

There may be a reduction in the recycling rate due to loss of the recycling banks

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

There may be some positive impact – in that people do not have to travel to recycle.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact identified

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Management		
Savings Name	Reduce Payments to Social Enterprises (SEs)		
Budget (£m)	£0.450m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference CS/28

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Funding to SEs to be reduced by removing payments for materials where there is an existing established market with income paid – e.g. textiles and scrap metal.

The main focus of the SEs will turn to reuse of household items such as furniture and bric a brac. Groups will be incentivised to deal with more challenging items currently with few end destinations and markets such as carpets/rugs and mattresses.

The affected SEs (Blythwood, Newstart and Homeaird in particular) have been consulted.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.150	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.150	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Some SEs may lose a considerable part of their income stream through these proposals due to their current mix of activities.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Negative impact but mitigation identified – there is the potential for negative impact on Social Enterprises some of whom employ disabled people. The Social Enterprises will still receive funding but at a reduced rate.

Discussions have been ongoing with SEs highlighting the proposed changes to the funding model and working with them to diversify and access other funding streams.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact identified

Budget Template

Service	Community services		
Activity Heading	Waste Management		
Savings Name	Blue Bin recycling – increased materials		
Budget (£m)	£9.516m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference CS/30

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

To increase the range of materials that can be recycled via the blue bins. On completion of data analysis in October, we will be able to clarify the % saving. Every 1000 tonnes (circa 1%) increase in blue bin recyclables equates to a projected saving of £70k per annum.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.070	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.070	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

With reduced quality of recyclate, there is a risk, if market conditions become more challenging, that there may be fewer opportunities to find contractors to deal with the co-mingled mix.

Any assumption is potential % increases is dependent on the public and commercial customers changing their attitudes / behaviour towards recycling.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Management		
Savings Name	Street Cleansing – Sutherland		
Budget (£m)	£3.411m	Staffing (FTE)	76.1

Reference CS/31

Savings Proposal

Reduce the number of mechanical brushes in Sutherland from three to one in line with other rural Highland areas.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.098	2
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.098	2

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Proposal would require significant re-routing.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – this is bringing street cleaning arrangements in Sutherland in line with other areas in Highland.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact – this is bringing street cleaning arrangements in Sutherland in line with other areas in Highland.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services.		
Activity Heading	Public Convenience Cleaning		
Savings Name	Rationalisation of Highland Comfort Schemes		
Budget (£m)	£1.160m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference CS/32

Savings Proposal

The re-negotiation of 12 Highland Comfort Scheme agreements which are presently being paid at a higher rate than that agreed at TECS Committee in 2011.

This agreement limits payment to properties providing toilet facilities to £300 per month.

Highland Comfort Schemes requiring re-negotiation are Ardgour Inn, Ardgour ; Strontian Stores, Strontian ; Eigg Trading Ltd, Isle of Eigg ; Invergarry Community Hall ; Kilmallie Community Hall ; Ice Factory, Kinlochleven ; Glen Uig (seasonal) ; Kyleakin (seasonal) ; Staffin (seasonal) ; Ardvaser (seasonal) ; Glenelg (seasonal) and Minginish (seasonal).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.010	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.010	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Some providers may not wish to re-negotiate to lower rates and may withdraw their facilities from the service.

Areas will need to identify alternative viable premises prior to commencing negotiations. It is assumed there will be alternative premises available in most villages.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – this is a rationalisation of contract payments and once re-negotiated, will not affect the service to the public and there are no staffing implications.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact identified

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Horticulture		
Savings Name	Growing and Planting		
Budget (£m)	£0.367m	Staffing (FTE)	10

Reference CS/33

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

A) Transfer operation of horticultural nurseries to local Social Enterprise schemes; potentially requires 2 FTE under TUPE to provide transference of skills.

If A) undeliverable then option B)

- Cease growing flowers and building/providing floral decorations – option to buy plants from the market.
- Close Council plant nurseries: Inverness, Wick and Thurso – option to continue to purchase bedding plants for immediate planting only.
- Cease planting of annual flowers – option to grass over flower beds

Common Good funded planting could be procured directly from Social Enterprise scheme or commercial sector.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.367	10
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.367	10

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

N/a

Deliverability and Risks

Significant officer input will be required to identify potential Social Enterprise operators and assist in developing Business Cases (this work has yet to start, hence the reason the saving is in year 2). There is of course a risk that no Social Enterprise may be interested and also, if they are interested, their business case may not be sustainable. If the Social Enterprise option is viable, there is also a risk that the full saving may not be achievable.

If Social Enterprise Schemes are not viable then Option B would be taken forward. If this happens, there is a risk of adverse publicity over loss of public floral planting, including war memorial displays.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

The Panel reported that this proposal was **a change that could be coped with** (34%) or **would make no difference** (28%) to them or their family. The Panel reported that the impact on the wider community could either be coped with or would be a positive change.

Communities Panel (community groups) and Website Survey (others choosing to respond)

Respondents to these 2 surveys reported similar impacts to the Citizens' Panel - that the proposal would either make no difference or was a change that could be coped with by their group or individually and that it could be coped with by the wider community.

It was one of the proposals that caused least concern across all those considered.

Equalities

Some participants expressed concern at negative consequences for people with disabilities who were employed in the nurseries to be shut.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

There is potential negative impact on staff if facilities close without other arrangements in place, including a small number of disabled people. However, the impact may be positive if employees/trainees transfer to a Social Enterprise.

Possible mitigating actions include:

- Reduce savings by £72k (HLH running costs) or HLH fully fund running of Floral Hall
- Use Common Good Funds
- Agree Lease with Wick CC or with Social Enterprise Company

An alternative could be to seek deliverability of the whole function through a Social Enterprise, including the running of the Floral Hall.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

No rural impact identified

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Grounds Maintenance		
Savings Name	Play Area Inspections		
Budget (£m)	£0.496m	Staffing FTE	116.8

Reference CS/35

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Standardise frequencies for safety and structural inspections of the 400 Community Services and 120 Care & Learning play areas.

Deliver consistent standards of inspection, maintenance and replacement across all areas based upon assessment of risk. Combine routine maintenance with inspection site visits.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	0.5
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	0.5

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Statutory annual safety inspections are undertaken by an external body. Inspection and maintenance in CS and C&L is carried out in various ways and harmonising how this is done will produce savings.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Car Parks		
Savings Name	Introduce Sunday charging in car parks		
Budget (£m)	(0.739m) income target	Staffing (FTE)	10

Reference CS/36a

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Update formal Parking Orders to include charging on Sundays for all city centre car parks and the Rose St MSCP, plus Fort William.

Figures are available from the Rose Street multi-storey barrier entrances and suggest the entry flows on a Sunday account for ~10% of the total weekly flows. This figure has been used as an estimate Highland-wide.

The total income for parking in Inverness and Fort William (2013) was £913,984 and £182,684 respectively, as well as approximately £40,000 from Portree and approximately £20,000 from Aviemore. Applying the above Sunday rate, an additional income of approximately £104,175 could be realised. The Rose Street multi-storey would however require to be staffed on a Sunday as a consequence of the proposals and this has been netted off.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.095	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.095	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact.

Deliverability and Risks

The main risk is negativity from local business and how the parking charges will affect trade in the urban centres. Trade appears to be low with establishments like The Victorian Market closed on Sundays which is in part due to the lower footfall figures experienced. With other out of town retail centres offering free parking, there may be a risk of reduced town centre trade.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

Panel members were divided on the impact of this proposal on them and their family. 35% of Panel respondents noted this proposal **could cause some difficulty** to them, a further 30% indicated however that this was a **change that could be coped with**. Just under half reported that the change was one which **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

53% of groups indicated that this proposal **would make no difference** to them but 49% that it **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

Respondents were divided on the impact of this proposal both to them individually and the wider community. 36% reported it was a change that **could be coped with** for them individually but 31% that it **could cause some difficulty**. 40% noted that it **could cause some difficulty** for the wider community but 36% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

No unlawful discrimination is identified although the proposals may affect those attending church on Sundays.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

No rural impact identified

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Charging for the use of the HQ car park		
Savings Name	Weekend charging for the use of HQ car park		
Budget (£m)	(0.739m) income target	Staffing (FTE)	10

Reference CS/36d

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Introduce car park charging at HQ. Charging for the use of the HQ car park will require the introduction of parking ticket and payment infrastructure. A new Parking Order would be required involving public consultation etc. Access control required for the quadrangle and ticket machines at 6 locations. Assumption is that this is paid for from capital. There will be an impact on other free parking nearby (Eden Court) and local streets.

If this was combined with the further proposal of car parking charges on a Sunday then additional revenue would be gained.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.020	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact.

Deliverability and Risks

Members of the public are able to park at HQ for free and there is no disruption to the local road network. Introducing charges may result in parking on street, for free, in the surrounding area where there are no traffic regulation orders preventing them from doing so.

With no data available on how well utilised the HQ car park is at weekends, it is difficult to ascertain how many cars would then be subject to charging and thus it is not possible to generate an accurate figure of what income could be generated. However, figures from the nearby Cathedral car park have been utilised to approximate this.

Consultation feedback

Summary

The majority of respondents across all three surveys reported that it was a change that would not affect them, could be coped with or viewed it as a positive for both them individually or for the wider community. It was one of the proposals that caused least concern across all those considered.

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive

3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>) No impact identified.	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) No rural impact.	

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Car Parking		
Savings Name	Review charging structure – Rose Street multi-storey		
Budget (£m)	(0.739m) income target	Staffing (FTE)	10

Reference CS/36e

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It is proposed to consider increasing the charges at the Rose Street multi-storey car park to be more in line with the charging structure offered in the Eastgate car parks, but with the addition of a 2 hours or less option aimed at retail shoppers, which is not currently offered by Eastgate car parks.

Using 2013/14 usage levels of Rose Street car park, it can be calculated that implementing the proposed structure could generate around £210,000 in revenue annually.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.210	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.210	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact.

Deliverability and Risks

The approximate figure of £210,000 is based on the current usage of Rose Street, and the length of stay of its customers. It should be noted that an increase in parking charges could result in a drop in usage levels, and/or customers shortening the period of time they park in Rose Street multi-storey. Therefore, the actual amount of extra income generated could be lower. In turn, lower usage levels may also carry the risk of negatively affecting trade in the city centre.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Recycling		
Savings Name	Review of Recycling Centres Opening Hours		
Budget (£m)	£9.516m	Staffing (FTE)	80

Reference CS/37

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This proposal is to reduce the opening hours of those recycling centres that currently open for 6 or 7 days per week.

This will include operating on a standard 5 day week covering from Thursday through to Monday (i.e. closed on Tuesdays and Wednesdays) in all Recycling Centres with the following exceptions:

1. Inverness Recycling Centre - reduced daily opening hours only.
2. Recycling Centres that are linked with waste transfer stations / landfill sites.
3. Recycling Centres which open for less than 6 days per week.

Financial Year 2017/18 reflects savings from reduced opening hours. 2018/19 reflects savings achieved from operating on a standard 5 day week covering from Thursday through to Monday (this aligns with and is additional to CS12 – Revision of Working Hours – and the reason why the saving is scheduled for 17/18 – 18/19)

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18	0.024	
2018/19	0.026	
Aggregate	0.050	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There may be a reduction in recycling rates

Deliverability and Risks

The proposal is deliverable but does require Trade Union consultation to accommodate a change to employees working patterns.

There may be a reduction in the recycling rate and increase in flytipping due to the reduced opening hours; however, from previous experience when we introduced the bulky collection charges, these fears were unfounded as the majority of the public will not fly-tip.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel (representative views) and Website Survey (others choosing to respond)

Respondents to both surveys had similar views with around a quarter indicating that the proposal **could cause some difficulty** to them but the remaining respondents reporting that it was a **change that could be coped with** or **would make no difference**. Around a third of respondents reported that it was a **change that could be coped with** or **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

52% of groups reported this change would have no impact on them however 41% reported that it was a change that

could cause some difficulty and 38% that it was **a change that could be coped with.**

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact - this proposal refers to reducing operating hours for recycling facilities.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact identified