

Appendix 8- Impact Assessment

The strategy set out in this report has also been subject to a full impact assessment. This follows the Council's standard impact assessment methodology for strategies and major plans. The impact assessment is presented in 2 sections:

- Table 1 – Community impacts (including equality impact assessment)
- Table 2 – Other impacts (including economic and environmental impacts)

Financial impact and legal issues are covered within the main body of the report.

It should be noted that the community impact section goes further than the current minimum legal requirement and considers the full range of protected characteristics that will apply from 1 April 2011. Where possible we have carried out a full analysis of Community Panel data for different groups to identify any statistically significant differences in responses (in some cases, number of responses have been too small to draw any definite conclusions).

The impact assessment has been based on the results of consultation and engagement activities, as well as information and data supplied by relevant service managers. Tables 1 and 2 should be read in conjunction with Appendix 6.

Table 1 – Community Impact

Group	Impacts identified – Yes/No?	Number	Description of impacts with supporting evidence	Proposed actions to reduce, manage or enhance impacts where appropriate
People of different ages – children and young people	Yes	1	The aim of the proposed extra funding for Children’s Social Care is to continue to meet the need for care placements for Children in Care (CIC). This proposal was supported by 84% of the Community Panel (January 2011).The number of children in care in the Borough is currently higher than the national average and has increased from 251 at the end of March 2009 to approximately 280 at the end of January 2011. This investment will have a positive impact on this highly vulnerable group, as this should help to keep them safe from neglect and harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete current review of services for children and families to include proposals that are designed to reduce the overall unit cost of placements in future (this will include proposals for a best value approach to placements and to put in place intensive, responsive family support for those in care or at risk of entering care and to support rehabilitation to the family from care). These proposals will be subject to a separate engagement programme and impact assessment as part of the service review process.
		2	The aim of the continued investment in Sports & Learning Communities across the Borough is to have a positive impact on all school-age children (and the wider community) by modernising and improving secondary schools and associated leisure, sports and community facilities. This investment was identified as the most important out of a list of 10 long-term investments by the Young People’s Forum and the 3= most important across all groups and forums consulted in January 2010. Sports & Learning Communities will provide comprehensive, integrated childcare and education, a focal point for delivering the 14-19 and	

		adult learning agenda, local service delivery points for integrated multi agency service and comprehensive sport, culture, leisure and community facilities. The SLCs will complement other regeneration and investment programmes, maximising value for money, for example in Dawley where the schools will create footfall to ensure the sustainability of the local centre. As a result we expect to see increased attainment, affordable accessible sports, increased participation and cohesion and increased involvement of low participation groups.	
	3	The loss of the Young Carers Pathfinder Grant will mean that the current 2-year pilot pathfinder project will end. However, the core Young Carers Support Service will continue and the existing provider will be re-commissioned for 2011/12. This will mean that the 44 young carers the service is currently working with will continue to be supported, although not as intensively as under the pathfinder project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek additional funding for the longer-term – options being explored include NHS carers allocation, external funding sources (Transition Fund, Big Lottery)
	4	The proposal to reduce the play budget is expected to have a minimal impact on the children and young people that use these services (4,281 young people aged between 5-19 years), as savings will be delivered by improved utilisation of buildings.	
	5	The proposal to reduce spending on the Playing for Success programme as a result of loss of specific grant funding will not impact on after school activity that is currently provided to 280 children and young people. The savings proposal relates to the deletion of a managerial post with Playing for Success being managed by one person rather than two.	

		6	The proposal for parents to opt-in to non-mandatory milk provision in schools will reduce the 25% of milk that is currently wasted as some children do not drink the milk provided. The proposal will ensure that all children whose parents want them to have free milk will still receive it (this proposal was supported by 88% of groups at consultation meetings and 96% of people who took part in engagement events – January 2011).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate opt-in scheme to parents on and monitor take-up; • Continue to invest in the provision of fresh drinking water for all schools throughout the school day
People of different ages – 18-65	No	7	No specific impacts relating to this age group have been identified through consultation meetings or engagement events. There are, however, some statistically significant different responses to particular questions in the Community Panel. These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly higher % of 18-44 year olds disagree with the proposal to reduce spending on road and pavement maintenance than other age groups; - Significantly higher % of 45-64 year olds agree with the proposal to withdraw the Twister service than the 18-44 age group. 	
People of different ages – older people	Yes	8	The aim of the continued investment in extra care housing is to have a positive impact by providing additional specialist housing for older people. The proposed investment for 2011/12 will be used to support the development of an extra care housing scheme at Lawley for older people, which is likely to include 60 two-bedroom apartments for individuals or couples and communal facilities (restaurant, social areas etc) that will also be available for use by the local community. The scheme will provide the basis for the delivery of outreach services for the wider community. Housing will be allocated on the basis of an individual's housing and care needs. The Council's	

		contribution will lever in additional investment of up to £10m from the Homes & Communities Agency (HCA), the housing association partner and others. This investment was ranked as the 2nd most important out of a list of 10 long-term investments by a range of local groups and forums and was supported by 88% of the Community Panel in January 2010.	
	9	<p>The proposal to revert to the national concessionary travel scheme (removing the discretionary service currently available between 9.00-9.30am) will impact on older people who are eligible for this service (in September 2010, there were 22,375 older people who were concessionary bus card holders). Overall, 73% of Community Panel members aged 65+ agreed with this proposal (19% disagreed), which was not statistically significantly different to other age groups (January 2011). However, a number of specific issues about the impact of this proposal on older people have been raised during the consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The revised service would mean that older people could not travel free of charge to day centres or hospital/doctors appointments before 9.30am (raised at Voluntary and Community Forum, Rural Forum, Parishes Forum); - The revised service would have a greater impact on older people in rural areas with less frequent bus services (raised at Rural Forum). In September 2010, 3,517 concessionary bus card holders lived in 'rural' postcodes (approximately 16% of the total). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm with Arriva the option of continuing to offer concessionary travel between 9.00-9.30am in remote rural areas where bus services are particularly infrequent • Promote to users of concessionary travel service the system where they can choose the time of their hospital/doctors appointment, reducing the need to travel before 9.30am
	10	The proposal to increase charges for services to help	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set level of increase so that service

			<p>people with low level tasks like shopping and cleaning will impact on the 342 (primarily older) people who currently use this non-statutory service. The maximum increase in charges will be £4 per week and the service will continue to be subsidised by the Council (to recover costs in full, we would need to increase charges to over £11 per hour). These changes will not affect statutory personal care or those who need intensive support. Overall, 56% of Community Panel members aged 65+ agreed with this proposal (24% disagreed), which was not statistically significantly different to other age groups. The consultation process has highlighted that there are variable opinions about how much charges should increase – some people feel the proposed increase is too large (Voluntary and Community Forum, Connecting Communities Group, Young People’s Forum), whilst others feel the Council should increase charges further so that they are not subsidising this service (Rural Forum, Parishes Forum).</p>	<p>continues to be subsidised (not full cost recovery) to reflect preventative nature of service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote benefit take-up and financial support available for people using service to ensure they are claiming all they are entitled to, to help reduce impact of increase • Explore alternative option of voluntary sector/social enterprise providing this service in the longer-term
		11	<p>In terms of other budget proposals, there are two other areas where there are statistically significant differences between Community Panel respondents aged 65+ and other age groups. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly higher % of people aged 65+ than those aged 18-44 who agree with the proposal to increase charges for leisure and cultural services; - Significantly higher % of people aged 65+ than those aged 18-44 who agree with the proposal to withdraw the Twister service. 	
People with a long-term	Yes	12	The investment in Disabled Facilities Grants will have a positive impact on people with a disability by	

limiting illness or disability		providing aids and adaptations to enable people to remain in their own homes (for example during 2010/11, we have issued approximately 200 grants at an average of £6,000 per grant). This proposal was supported by 94% of Community Panel members with a long-term limiting illness or disability (LTLI), which was significantly higher than those without LTLI (January 2011).	
	13	A number of people have raised concerns through the consultation process about the impact of reducing spend on maintenance of pavements on those with mobility problems or a visual impairment (Disabilities Forum, Voluntary and Community Forum). This is reinforced by data from the Community Panel (January 2011), which shows that a significantly higher % of people with a LTLI disagreed with this proposal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the proposed saving from the budget proposals in recognition of public concerns
	14	Similarly, a significantly higher % of Community Panel respondents (January 2011) with a LTLI disagreed with the proposals to switch off street lights at night and to reduce maintenance of street lights (it should be noted that this issue was not raised at any of the consultation meetings in 2011, although it was highlighted by the Disabilities Forum in January 2010 when the Council first began to switch off street lights at night). Overall, 92% of the Community Panel supported the proposal to switch off street lights at night (January 2011). No formal complaints have been received about the switching off of street lights at night this year and there is no accident data linked to switching off of street lights to date.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to focus switch-off of street lights at night in non-residential areas and continue to light slip roads, junctions and residential areas Meet with Disabilities Forum to highlight roads where it is proposed to extend switch off lights at night in order to identify any particular locations where there may be specific issues for people with a LTLI Review impact of these savings on people with a LTLI after 6 months, reviewing any complaints/issues/accident data in this period in conjunction with the Disabilities Forum
	15	The proposal to revert to the national concessionary travel scheme (removing the discretionary service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm with Arriva the option of continuing to offer concessionary travel between 9.00-

			currently available between 9.00-9.30am) will impact on eligible disabled people (in September 2010, there were 1,355 disabled people who were concessionary bus card holders). Overall, 66% of Community Panel members with a LTLI agreed with this proposal, however 23% disagreed, which was statistically significantly higher than those without a LTLI (January 2011). The Voluntary and Community Forum highlighted the issue of disabled people not being able to travel free of charge to hospital/day centre appointments (NB for hospital referrals, GPs are able to request free hospital transport for disabled people that they feel will have transport difficulties).	<p>9.30am in remote rural areas where bus services are particularly infrequent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote to users of concessionary travel service the system where they can choose the time of their hospital/doctors appointment, reducing the need to travel before 9.30am • Promote alternative transport options to eligible disabled people (for people in rural areas, this includes taxi tokens as an alternative to a concessionary travel pass – it is proposed to increase taxi token allocations from £16 to £30 per annum)
		16	The proposal to reduce spending in relation to the Speech Language Therapy Service will be realised through delivery of vacant posts and generating additional income. Indications have been given from external parties that they wish to buy-in to the service for 2011/12 and discussions are ongoing. There will therefore be no impact to current levels of service (this was flagged as ‘no impacts’ in our budget strategy, but a specific impact assessment was requested by CYP Scrutiny Committee).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively promote service to schools
		17	In terms of other budget proposals, the only other statistically significant difference was that a higher % of Community Panel respondents with a LTLI disagreed with the proposal to increase cemetery charges (January 2011).	
People of different genders or	No	18	No specific issues relating to people of different genders or who are transgender have been highlighted through consultation meetings or engagement events.	

who are transgender			<p>There are, however, some statistically significant differences in responses of people of different genders to particular questions in the Community Panel. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly higher % of female respondents who support investment in Children's Social Care and supporting vulnerable people to stay in their own homes; - Significantly higher % of male respondents who agree with the proposal to increase cemetery burial charges; - Significantly higher % of male respondents who disagree with proposals to increase taxi licence fees and reduce frequency of road sweeping. 	
Different racial groups	Yes	19	<p>One person (Connecting Communities Group) has raised a concern about the impact of the proposal to increase cemetery burial charges on certain racial groups, whose culture and traditions focus around burial, removing the alternative option of cremation for these groups. Looking at responses to this proposal in the Community Panel, there was no statistically significant difference between BME and white respondents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take account of the cost of other authority charges and cremation charges to ensure that price of burials in TWC cemeteries remains competitive
		20	<p>The savings proposal regarding traveller sites relates to improved procurement of repairs and maintenance and new arrangements for utility billing. There are 36 pitches on 2 sites (31 are currently occupied).</p>	
		21	<p>The proposal to reduce spending in relation to the Schools Multicultural Service will be realised through delivery of vacant posts and generating additional income. Indications have been given from external parties that they wish to buy-in to the service for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively promote service to schools

			2011/12 and discussions are ongoing. There will therefore be no impact to current levels of service (this was flagged as 'no impacts' in our budget strategy, but a specific impact assessment was requested by CYP Scrutiny Committee).	
		22	In terms of other budget proposals, a statistically significant higher % of BME respondents than white respondents disagreed with the proposal to switch off street lights between midnight and 5am.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to focus switch-off of street lights at night in non-residential areas and continue to light slip roads, junctions and residential areas • Review impact of this saving after 6 months, reviewing any complaints/issues/accident data in this period
People with different religion or beliefs	No	23	No specific issues relating to people of different religions or beliefs have been highlighted through the consultation process.	
People of different sexual orientation	No	24	No specific issues relating to people of different sexual orientation have been highlighted through the consultation process.	
People living in particular wards/areas of the Borough, including the rural area	Yes	25	The aim of the continued investment in Borough Town Centres (including Dawley, Wellington, Newport, Hadley and Oakengates) is to regenerate and have a positive economic, environmental and social impact on these specific areas of the Borough. This investment was ranked as the most important out of a list of 10 long-term investments by a range of local groups and forums and was supported by 83% of the Community Panel in January 2010.	
		26	The aim of the continued investment in Woodside and Sutton Hill is to regenerate and have a positive	

			<p>economic, environmental and social impact on these specific areas of the Borough. In January 2010, this investment was ranked as 3= out of a list of 10 long-term investments, although support amongst the Community Panel was lower than for Borough Town regeneration (65%). The regeneration projects will continue to focus on issues raised by residents as their major concerns, such as crime and community safety, and all residents will be encouraged and supported to get involved.</p>	
		27	<p>The proposal to withdraw the Twister service relates to two specific zones within the rural area where this service has been piloted for the last 3 years (it is not currently available across the whole rural area). These zones include Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine, Ellerdine, Great Bolas, Waters Upton, Crudgington, High Ercall, Roden and Rodington. Of the registered users of the service, only 20 have travelled during the last 6 months. Overall, 83% of the Community Panel supported the proposal (January 2011) and there were no significant differences in responses to this proposal between different geographic areas. However, a specific concern has been raised through the consultation process about potential social isolation for current users who may have become reliant on the service (Connecting Communities Group, Rural Forum) and a number of people suggested talking directly to service users. In response to this, regular users were contacted to discuss the proposal in more detail (14 people took part). Of these 14 people, 9 people also used a car, either as a driver or passenger. In addition, 13 were concessionary travel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote alternative transport options such as taxi tokens or the voluntary car scheme to any users who may have difficulty using the Wrekin Connect service (NB it is proposed to increase the allocation of taxi tokens to people in rural areas from £16 to £30 per annum) • Promote a revised Wrekin Connect service • Following withdrawal of the service, contact all regular users of the service again within one month to ensure that they are aware of and are able to access an appropriate transport option

			pass holders. If the proposal is approved, people will continue to have the option of using the Wrekin Connect bus service as an alternative means of transport, although Wrekin Connect is not available every day in all areas and is not demand-responsive. This will bring services in these areas in line with other rural parts of the Borough.	
		28	<p>In terms of other budget proposals, there are a number of proposals where there are statistically significant variations in responses between different geographic areas. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly higher % of respondents in Wellington and Newport who support increased car parking charges than Telford Central; - Significantly higher % of respondents in Wellington and Newport who support increase in cemetery burial charges than Telford Central; - Significantly higher % of respondents in Telford South who disagree with certain proposed reductions in service, such as reduced frequency of grass cutting and removal of concessionary travel between 9-9.30am. 	
People affected by deprivation	Yes	29	<p>Some comments have been made during the consultation process regarding the effect of increasing charges on people affected by deprivation. The consultation process suggests that some people have a general concern about the impact of these proposals on people affected by deprivation (Community Panel – 31, Voluntary and Community Forum). Proposals where ‘ability to pay’ and need for concessions was specifically raised as an issue were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased charges for low-level preventative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Council’s concessions policy and ensure that there is a consistent approach to concessions across services <p>In addition, there are various specific mitigating actions the Council is proposing to take, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re: low-level preventative service - promote benefit take-up and financial

			<p>service (Community Panel – 24);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standard charges for bulk collections (Community Panel – 9, Voluntary & Community Forum); - Charges for Flex card/admissions to leisure centres (Connecting Communities Group, Parishes Forum); - Increased charges for cemetery burial (Connecting Communities Group). <p>For some of these changes, it will be a matter of personal choice whether a person seeks to use the service. Analysis of Community Panel data suggests two areas where there are significantly significant differences in responses based on deprivation (Index of Multiple Deprivation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A significantly higher % of respondents who were in the most 20-30% deprived opposed the proposal to increase cemetery burial charges than those in the least 20-30% deprived; - A significantly higher % of respondents in the least 10% deprived supported the proposal to increase taxi licensing fees than those in the most 10% deprived (this may relate to some concerns being expressed that increase in licence fee will result in higher fares for the public – Community Panel (4), Voluntary and Community Forum). 	<p>support available for people using service to ensure they are claiming all they are entitled to, to help reduce impact of increase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re: charges for bulk collection - promote 'Chairs & Spares', a social enterprise that re-uses furniture and electrical items, who will collect appropriate items in Telford & Wrekin and surrounding areas free of charge • Re: cemetery charges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take account of the cost of other authority charges and cremation charges to ensure that price of burials in TWC cemeteries remains competitive (current burial charges are approximately 40% below the national average – proposed charges will still be £140 less or a fifth below the average neighbouring councils charged in 2009/10); - Promote financial support that is available from the Dept for Work and Pensions (DWP) Social Fund (Social Fund Funeral Payment) for those in receipt of benefits and able to demonstrate that they meet the criteria for support.
Women who are pregnant or breast-	No	30	No specific issues relating to women who or are pregnant or are breast-feeding have been highlighted through the consultation process.	

feeding				
People who are married or are in a civil partnership	No	31	No specific issues relating to people who are married or who are in a civil partnership have been highlighted through the consultation process.	

Table 2 – Impact Assessment (Other Impacts)

Impact	Impacts identified – Yes/No?	No	Description of impacts with supporting evidence	Proposed actions to reduce, manage or enhance impacts where appropriate
Environmental	Yes	33	The proposal to extend the switch-off of non-residential street lights between midnight and 5.00am will have a positive environmental impact by reducing energy consumption of street lights by 500,000 kWh, which would also reduce carbon emissions by 270 tonnes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue with the scheme ensuring that residential areas are not affected
		34	The aim of the proposed investment in a new waste bulking station is to have a positive environmental impact by helping to divert an additional 21,000 tonnes of waste from landfill in the first year of operation and give the Council more options to manage recyclable materials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue with the proposal to minimise cost of waste disposal
		35	Strong concerns have been expressed through the consultation process about the proposal to reduce revenue spend on maintenance of roads and pavements, despite the fact that the impact of this will be reduced by the continued capital investment in the planned maintenance programme. 56% of the Community Panel disagreed with the proposal (only 32% agreed) and reduced road/pavement maintenance was the most frequently raised concern during the on-street engagement. The consultation process suggests that people regard maintenance of roads and pavements as an essential environmental service and are concerned about the current levels of potholes, particularly following recent cold weather.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the proposed saving from the budget proposals in recognition of public concerns
		36	Concerns have also been raised through the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain this service with a full cost recovery

		consultation process about the proposal to remove the pest control service for rats and mice (only 36% of the Community Panel agreed and 50% disagreed). The consultation process suggests that people regard pest control as an important environmental/public health service that should be retained even if this is provided for a charge.	charge (this option will also require robust enforcement of public health problems and statutory nuisances arising from premises whose occupiers fail to treat infestations)
	37	The proposals to reduce the frequency of some aspects of environmental maintenance (shrub bed maintenance, grass cutting and road sweeping) will inevitably impact to some extent on the quality of the environment, although advice from service managers is that this should be minimal. Amongst the Community Panel, the majority of people agreed with proposals to reduce shrub bed maintenance (87%), grass cutting (85%) and road sweeping (76%).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to sweep roads in Borough Town Centres and District Town Centres at current frequencies (daily/weekly) • Cut grass/shrubs along major roads and at junctions and roundabouts at a frequency that will ensure the safety of road-users • Engage regularly with Parish/Town Councils to identify any areas where reduced environmental maintenance is having a particular visual impact
	38	The proposal to charge for new and replacement bins has also been highlighted through the consultation process as having a potential environmental impact. This was the 2 nd least well supported proposal amongst 'Your Money, Your Views' respondents; reasons for this included concerns that the charge could deter people from recycling and could increase fly-tipping.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the proposal so that any charge applies to new and additional grey bins only (i.e. no charge for recycling bins/receptacles or green bins and no charge for any replacement bins)
	39	Some concerns (82 members of the Community Panel) have been raised through the consultation process about a possible increase in fly-tipping as a result of the proposal to extend charging for bulk collections to all residents (this is currently free for assisted pull-out customers). Charging for the majority of residents was introduced in June and since this date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to monitor fly-tipping levels and engage with Town and Parish Councils to identify any fly-tipping hotspots • Promote 'Chairs & Spares', a social enterprise that re-uses furniture and electrical items, who will collect appropriate items in Telford & Wrekin and surrounding

			levels of fly-tipping have not increased significantly (from January-December 2010 we have received only 1 complaint). The current proposals, which will increase the number of households liable to a charge by around 8%, are therefore considered unlikely to have a significant impact.	areas free of charge
Economic	Yes	40	The aim of the proposed investment in Telford Town Centre is to have a positive economic impact. Investment by the Council will lever in significant private sector and inward investment, including façade upgrades to bowling and bingo (equivalent to an investment of £0.83m), multi-screen cinema, commercial office space (12,606 m ²), budget hotel, A class uses (4,800m ²) and extensions to the international centre (equivalent to £32m). A particular focus will be to encourage business tourism and to increase the capacity of the conferencing quarter in Telford – we expect to attract an additional 200,000 visitors to the area per annum through this investment. This development will also generate and sustain additional and diversified employment opportunities.	
		41	The aim of the continued investment in Borough Town Centres (including Dawley, Wellington, Newport, Hadley and Oakengates) is to regenerate and have a positive economic impact on these specific areas of the Borough. The benefits of this investment includes job creation (construction and jobs created by businesses taking up retail/office space), enhanced perception of towns (leading to further inward investment & expansion of existing businesses) and shoppers and visitors being attracted to the Borough Towns.	

		42	<p>The aim of the continued investment in Sports & Learning Communities is to have a positive impact on the education and skills of all school-age children (and the wider community) by modernising and improving secondary schools and associated leisure, sports and community facilities. The development of the Sports & Learning Communities includes proposals for a University Technical College (UTC), which specialises in technical studies and is sponsored by a University. The UTC will prepare students for work through practical enterprise-themed projects. We will look to recruit an appropriate local employer to work with us on the development of the UTC. Through the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme, Keir Moss will directly engage with partner schools to improve the employment prospects of students in construction and other sectors.</p>	
		43	<p>Some concerns have been raised about the economic impact of the proposal to increase car parking charges in Ironbridge and the car park at the back of the Range in Telford Town Centre. 45 Community Panel respondents felt that the proposed increases would drive shoppers away and 14 people commented that the proposals would discourage visitors. However, the majority of the Panel (60%) agreed with the proposal (29% disagreed) and increased car parking charges were generally well supported at consultation meetings. Charges in Ironbridge will increase by a maximum of 20p (£1.40 maximum charge), which will be lower than Ironbridge Gorge Museum car parks (£1.50 maximum charge). The Town centre car park will increase by a maximum of 40p (£3.10 maximum</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Ironbridge, continue to monitor on-street parking and work with the Police to manage this, especially during major events such as World Heritage day • In Ironbridge, continue to provide free residents' parking (via a permit system), disabled parking and coach parking

			charge), which will only be slightly higher than other neighbouring car parks (it should be stressed that the vast majority of Pay & Display car parks in Telford Town Centre are not owned or operated by the Council). In response to a request from the Community Focused, Efficient Council Scrutiny Committee, additional consultation was carried out with local traders in Ironbridge. Of the 20 traders who commented on the proposals as part of this consultation, only 3 disagreed, whilst 6 traders commented that charges are currently seen as being cheap. The Gorge Parish Council queried whether the proposed increases could lead to more on-street parking in residential streets.	
		44	A number of taxi drivers attended the Connecting Communities Group meeting to raise concerns about the impact of the proposed increase in taxi licence fees on their businesses (it should be noted that the proposal to move towards full cost recovery for taxi licence fees was determined by the Licensing Committee which operates on a quasi-judicial basis outside of the budget process). There was strong support for increasing taxi licence fees through the consultation process overall with 84% of the Panel agreeing with the proposal (6% disagreeing). For an individual taxi driver licence, the proposed increase will be £45 over a 2-year period and for an individual vehicle licence, the proposed increase will be £61 – these increases have been subject to a separate consultation process, which closed on 6 February 2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse results of consultation and review proposed fees Stagger agreed increases over a 2-year period to minimise economic impact
Other Risks &	Yes	45	The saving that is resulting from initiatives to reduce	

Opportunities			use of bed and breakfast accommodation also has wider non-financial benefits by helping to deal with homelessness and improving the quality of accommodation for homeless people.	
		46	The proposal to reduce the library book fund will have a small effect on the choice of books available. The proposed saving (£15k) is only 6% of the total book fund and this saving can be partially offset by funding for stock purchase that the Council is currently receiving from the PCT for health and well-being projects. New books and other stock is shared pro-rata across all libraries, so this proposal will not have a particular effect on any specific library.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to prioritise the book fund on target user groups, such as children and young people and adults with essential skills needs • Purchase books through a consortium with 3 other library authorities to obtain maximum discount
		47	The proposal to reduce spending on arts (development and events) will reduce the ability of the Council to match fund projects or partnerships, potentially reducing opportunities to deliver new arts projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to target funding on those projects that will have the greatest impact on delivering local priorities
		48	The Voluntary and Community Forum commented on the proposals to reduce grant funding to a number of voluntary sector organisations. We are currently in discussion with the organisations involved (CVS, CAB, Fairshare and A4U) about moving towards a new commissioning approach, which will lead to the Council commissioning services from voluntary organisations in line with community priorities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary and Community Sector Chief Executives Forum has been established and is jointly developing a commissioning approach with the Council • The Council is providing individual support to those funded organisations to help them revise their business plans to reflect reduced grant funding, and to find alternative independent funding, with a view to minimising the impact on service delivery
		49	The proposal to reduce targeted support in primary and secondary schools relates to targeted continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers delivered by the local authority. To mitigate any potential fall in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete current review of services for children, families and schools. These proposals will be subject to a separate engagement programme and impact

		standards, the Council is instead proposing to work in partnership with schools to identify and share learning 'school to school' in a range of new ways in accordance with the recent Schools White Paper (this forms part of the current review of services for children, families and schools).	assessment as part of the service review process
	50	Discussions with the Telford Race Equality & Diversity Partnership (TREDP) indicate that the proposed 20% reduction in the Council's core grant to TREDP will have a minimal impact on their organisation, as they are currently developing a new operating model and seeking charitable status, which will reduce their costs.	
	51	The proposal to delete the residential rehabilitation budget for substance misuse relates to the current residential capacity for 5 people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide alternative community-based day services