

Budget Saving - Initial Equality Impact Considerations

Directorate: Public Services

Title of option	Disposal of the Shay Stadium						
Aims/outcomes of Service/Function	<p>The Shay Stadium is currently owned by Calderdale MBC and rental agreements are in place with F.C. Halifax Town and Halifax Panthers rugby league team.</p> <p>The stadium provides a home venue for FC Halifax Town and Halifax Panthers Rugby Club. It also hosts functions and events and accommodates Council staff from Adults and Wellbeing and Children and Young People, acting as an office base.</p>						
Option being proposed	<p>The proposal would seek to transfer a long leasehold interest of the stadium to one of the clubs (with a sublet agreement to the other) or to a company that is jointly owned and run by the two sports clubs, together with the transfer of all operational responsibilities. Staff employed at the stadium would also need to be consulted with as TUPE may be required.</p> <p>If the two sports clubs were not interested in acquiring a transfer of the site, disposal could be considered on the 'open market' with the two clubs as 'sitting tenants' (any new owner would then assume responsibility for the current lease arrangements).</p> <p><u>Savings</u></p> <table data-bbox="639 1368 959 1480"> <tr> <td>2024/25</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025/26</td> <td>£161,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2026/27</td> <td>£161,000</td> </tr> </table>	2024/25	£0	2025/26	£161,000	2026/27	£161,000
2024/25	£0						
2025/26	£161,000						
2026/27	£161,000						
EIA findings	<p>No specific impacts identified on people with a protected characteristic in relation to the transfer of ownership of the stadium.</p> <p><u>Employment impact</u></p> <p>There are currently 4 Council staff working at the Shay that may be affected by a lease/transfer. However, terms and conditions would be protected at the point of transfer under TUPE legislation.</p>						

Justification (where no impact) and action(s) to manage/mitigate Impact	Ownership of the stadium has no particular bearing on its current and future use. Any physical changes arising as a result of a transfer would be unrelated and subject to a separate assessment by the then owner.
--	---

Budget Saving - Initial Equality Impact Considerations

Directorate: Public Services

Title of option	Reconfiguration of Sign Language and Translation Service						
Aims/outcomes of Service/Function	<p>The proposal seeks to modernise the current approach to providing sign language and translation services by adapting to new technology.</p> <p>The idea is to use new technologies to make it easier for people to interact with the Council without always needing someone in-house to interpret. This proposal is part of our effort to make our services more efficient and modern.</p> <p>We also want people to be more independent when dealing with the Council. By using technology, we're giving them the tools to connect with us on their own terms. This proposal is our way of moving forward and providing services that are both effective and accessible.</p>						
Option being proposed	<p>The BSL Interpreting Team is made up of 2 posts – 1 x BSL Interpreter and 1 x Support Assistant. The proposal is to delete these posts and replace with other solutions as most other local authorities in the Country have had in place for a number of years.</p> <p>During Year 1, the service delivery and recharge methods will be thoroughly reviewed to determine if more cost-effective alternatives can be implemented in Years 2 and 3</p> <p><u>Savings</u></p> <table> <tr> <td>2024/25</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025/26</td> <td>£29,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2026/27</td> <td>£29,000</td> </tr> </table>	2024/25	£0	2025/26	£29,000	2026/27	£29,000
2024/25	£0						
2025/26	£29,000						
2026/27	£29,000						
EIA findings	<u>Service delivery impact</u>						

	<p>Subject to the implementation of alternative more cost effective solutions the proposal should not have any adverse impact on people with a disability protected characteristic. There will be a full review of service delivery to ensure it is cost effective and meeting our statutory requirements.</p> <p>Ways to mitigate impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging in a comprehensive consultation with the Deaf Community to understand and address their accessibility needs. • Collaborating closely with the Interpreting Team and Disability Partnership to enhance website accessibility for the Deaf Community. • Investigating the adoption of services like Relay UK or SignVideo within Customer First, facilitating three-way video calls with the team and a BSL Interpreter. • Leveraging internal resources, such as the Hearing Impairment and Specialist Inclusion Teams. • Utilising external resources by arranging interpreters when necessary. • Implementing audio induction loops and text relay services to ensure continued support and accessibility. <p>Through the use of improved technological solutions, access to the service may actually increase (volume and time)</p> <p><u>Employment impact</u></p> <p>There are no equality impacts on staff working in the organisation as access to support that is provided in its current configuration would continue to be available in the transformed service.</p>
<p>Justification (where no impact) and action(s) to manage/mitigate Impact</p>	<p>Although alternative (digital) solutions will be explored and may increase access to support for some people, digitally excluded members of the deaf community will be most adversely impacted.</p> <p>Following a thorough review actions would be considered and investment made to mitigate the impact where practical (and affordable) to do so.</p>

Budget Saving - Initial Equality Impact Considerations

Directorate: Public Services

Title of option	Household Waste Recycling Centres - introduction of a permit scheme and review of operational hours.						
Aims/outcomes of Service/Function	Household Waste Recycling Centres provide a mechanism for people living in the borough to dispose of waste that is too large or in too great a volume to be collected at kerbside through conventional methods. It also makes provision for the disposal of aspects of waste that are not collected at kerbside.						
Option being proposed	<p>The introduction of a permit scheme across all five Household Waste Recycling Centres to reduce cross boundary usage by residents from neighbouring authorities and to cut the amount of trade waste that may enter the sites undetected.</p> <p>In addition, a move to winter operating hours all year round, with 4pm closures (as opposed to 5pm in summer) would generate a further £35k/year saving in operational costs.</p> <p><u>Savings</u></p> <table data-bbox="639 1039 959 1196"> <tr> <td>2024/25</td> <td>£115,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025/26</td> <td>£135,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2026/27</td> <td>£135,000</td> </tr> </table>	2024/25	£115,000	2025/26	£135,000	2026/27	£135,000
2024/25	£115,000						
2025/26	£135,000						
2026/27	£135,000						
EIA findings	<p><u>Service delivery impact</u></p> <p>There is no perceived detriment to the introduction of a permit scheme as this will be available to all residents living in the borough and would impact on all people equally.</p> <p>Support would be provided for the completion of any permit scheme if needed as a result of a protected characteristic.</p> <p><u>Employment impact</u></p> <p>A reduction in operating hours may have some impact on staffing within Suez (the contractor providing the service to the Council). Unless additional hours are made available to these staff there will be some impact on the 'local' protected characteristic of socio-economic (low wage/low income).</p>						
Justification (where no impact) and action(s) to manage/mitigate Impact							

Budget Saving - Initial Equality Impact Considerations

Directorate: Public Services

Title of option	Closure of Elland Household Waste Recycling Centre						
Aims/outcomes of Service/Function	Household Waste Recycling Centres provide a mechanism for people living in the borough to dispose of waste that is too large or in too great a volume to be collected at kerbside through conventional methods. It also makes provision for the disposal of aspects of waste that are not collected at kerbside.						
Option being proposed	<p>The option proposes the permanent closure of Elland HWRC upon the expiry of the initial term of the current Waste & Recycling contract with Suez (July 31st 2024).</p> <p><u>Savings</u></p> <table data-bbox="639 943 959 1104"> <tr> <td>2024/25</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025/26</td> <td>£100,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2026/27</td> <td>£150,000</td> </tr> </table>	2024/25	£0	2025/26	£100,000	2026/27	£150,000
2024/25	£0						
2025/26	£100,000						
2026/27	£150,000						
EIA findings	<p><u>Service delivery impact</u></p> <p>There is no disproportionate impact on a protected characteristic group.</p> <p>As a Unitary authority, Calderdale has a statutory duty under section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990 to provide HWRCs for the public to dispose of waste. The Environmental Protection Act simply states that they need to be “reasonably accessible to persons resident in the area”.</p> <p>The latest Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) guidance makes the following recommendations in relation to HWRC provision:</p> <ul data-bbox="699 1682 1514 1756" style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum number of inhabitants per HWRC = 120,000 • Maximum number of households per HWRC = 50,000 <p>When comparing the current provision in Calderdale to the above guidance it is clear there is a good network of HWRC’s - a ratio of one site per 42,000 residents and a site for every 19,000 households.</p>						

	<p>The potential closure of Elland HWRC would alter these ratios to one site per 52,500 residents and a site for every 23,750 households, which would still be well under the maximum recommended (and a better ratio than any of the other West Yorkshire authorities).</p> <p>The choice of Elland to be the site to close is due to much of the catchment area being outside Calderdale (estimated at over 50%), the proximity to the sites at Brighouse and Halifax, and the fact that it is the least used of the existing facilities.</p> <p><u>Employment impact</u></p> <p>The closure of Elland HWRC may have some impact on staffing within Suez (the contractor providing the service to the Council). Unless staff can be redeployed elsewhere within the business there would be some impact on the 'local' protected characteristic of socio-economic (low wage/low income).</p>
<p>Justification (where no impact) and action(s) to manage/mitigate Impact</p>	<p>The borough will continue to provide a network of HWRCs that are reasonably accessible to residents across the borough and that are in excess of the recommended minimum levels of provision.</p>

Budget Saving - Initial Equality Impact Considerations

Directorate: Public Services

<p>Title of option</p>	<p>Pest Control - Cessation of in-house traded service.</p>
<p>Aims/outcomes of Service/Function</p>	<p>The pest control service is a traded service that provides a response to household and business pest issues such as rats and wasp nests. Adequate alternative provision exists within the private sector at comparable competitive costs.</p>
<p>Option being proposed</p>	<p>The proposal is to phase out the pest control that is provided to individual households and businesses by 1st April whilst ensuring that any contractual obligations are fulfilled and that support and guidance is available for local residents and businesses about pests and how to access reputable service providers to deal with them.</p> <p><u>Savings</u></p>

	<p>2024/25 £12,000</p> <p>2025/26 £12,000</p> <p>2026/27 £12,000</p>
EIA findings	<p><u>Service delivery impact</u></p> <p>Due to the number of private sector providers that delivery services similar to the Council at competitive costs there is not deemed to be any disproportionate impact on any protected characteristic group.</p> <p><u>Employment impact</u></p> <p>There is no direct staffing impact as both members of staff are voluntarily ceasing their employment with the Council. Should that situation change adequate opportunity exists for redeployment within Public Services.</p>
Justification (where no impact) and action(s) to manage/mitigate Impact	<p>The number of alternative providers in the market that provide a service at a comparable cost to the former Council service.</p>

Budget Saving - Initial Equality Impact Considerations

Directorate: Public Services

Title of option	<p>Camera based traffic enforcement - moving traffic violations (TMA Pt 6) and Bus Lane monitoring.</p>
Aims/outcomes of Service/Function	<p>Councils are now able to apply for powers to enable enforcement of moving traffic offences, such as vehicles using bus lanes when not permitted, entering areas that are only available for loading/unloading or other use, violating 'no entry' or turning restrictions or being stationary on hatching that is designed to keep traffic free-flowing.</p> <p>This proposal seeks to implement those powers at sites across the borough.</p>
Option being proposed	<p>Cabinet has already agreed that bus lane enforcement should be progressed, and a further report is being prepared for Cabinet approval to seek the necessary powers for the wider enforcement permitted under the Traffic Management Act.</p>

	<p>Following approval from the Department of Transport cameras would be installed together with the establishment of a back office function to process information and issue/chase fines as necessary.</p> <p><u>Savings</u></p> <p>2024/25 £0</p> <p>2025/26 £0</p> <p>2026/27 £100,000</p>
EIA findings	<p><u>Service delivery impact</u></p> <p>The introduction of additional enforcement powers for moving traffic violations should make a positive contribution to road safety, supporting all road users. In particular there should be a positive impact on children and young people who are disproportionately affected according to traffic accident data.</p> <p><u>Employment impact</u></p> <p>There are no perceived impacts for staffing, although the provision of safer roads has a positive impact for everyone.</p>
Justification (where no impact) and action(s) to manage/mitigate Impact	

Budget Saving - Initial Equality Impact Considerations

Directorate: Public Services

Title of option	Library Book Fund
Aims/outcomes of Service/Function	The library book fund helps to ensure that library stock is kept up to date and makes provision for the purchase of books that respond to specific reader requests.
Option being proposed	<p>The proposal is to reduce the library book fund by £50,000 from a budget of £167,000 to £117,000.</p> <p><u>Savings</u></p> <p>2024/25 £50,000</p> <p>2025/26 £50,000</p> <p>2026/27 £50,000</p>

EIA findings	<p><u>Service delivery impact</u></p> <p>A reduction in the library book fund will reduce access to some new material, creating longer waiting times for people to access material of their choice.</p> <p>Although the proposal will have an equal impact across all protected characteristics its greatest impact is likely to be on the local protected characteristic of socio-economic (low wage/low income) where people will have less opportunity to purchase books rather than wait for availability in the borough libraries. There may also be a disproportionate impact on newer readers (children and young people) and on 'race' with reduced access to reading material in different community languages.</p> <p><u>Employment impact</u></p> <p>There are no direct staffing impacts in relation to a reduction in the budget for the library book fund.</p>
Justification (where no impact) and action(s) to manage/mitigate Impact	

Budget Saving - Initial Equality Impact Considerations

Directorate: Public Services

Title of option	Restructure (Neighbourhoods and Cohesion Team)
Aims/outcomes of Service/Function	<p>To build strong and resilient communities and enhance equality, diversity and inclusion within the organisation.</p> <p>Work takes place across all communities and in particular with new communities including economic migrants, asylum seekers and refugees. Work on Prevent, the government counter terrorism strategy is unaffected as all funded through Home Office grant.</p> <p>NB: Work on asylum and asylum hotels is unaffected as all funded through Home Office grant</p>
Option being proposed	<p>Restructure the Neighbourhoods and Cohesion Team to reduce staffing. Attempts will be made to maintain front line service delivery and resilience by focussing on the opportunities to align and reduce management functions.</p> <p><u>Savings</u></p> <p>2024/25 £40,000</p>

	<p>2025/26 £100,000</p> <p>2026/27 £100,000</p>
<p>EIA findings</p>	<p><u>Service delivery impact</u></p> <p>The proposal would have some inevitable impact on people with a protected characteristic in line with the service purpose to support stronger and more resilient communities through our 3 organisational priorities and most specifically reducing inequalities and stronger towns but in particular work focus tends to be on LGBTQ+, women, race and/or religion or belief as a protected characteristic as these are the key areas of work within and across communities.</p> <p>The current team equates to 21 members of staff. The proposed reduction through the restructure of two fte posts is less than 10 percent. As such most of the work that is currently taking place will continue to a significant extent.</p> <p>Some mitigation will also be achieved by focussing, where possible, on more managerial roles, thus protecting front line service delivery.</p> <p>Aspects of work may also need to be prioritised to ensure that the Council can continue to support and focus on those groups with a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Work has not commenced on plans for the restructure at the time of drafting the proposal (and EIA) and as such the EIA will be updated on an ongoing basis in order that the impacts of any changes are recorded and understood.</p> <p><u>Employment impact</u></p> <p>The proposal may have some impact on people working in the Council with one or more of the following protected characteristics: disability, race, religion or belief, gender reassignment, sex and sexual orientation as these groups comprise key areas of work within the Council and staff networks, where support may be affected.</p> <p>Work has not commenced on plans for the restructure at the time of drafting the proposal (and EIA) and as such the EIA will be updated on an ongoing basis in order that the impacts of any changes are recorded and understood.</p>
<p>Justification (where no impact) and action(s) to manage/mitigate Impact</p>	