

## **THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL IN 2015 – SERVICE CHANGE OPTIONS.**

**EXECUTIVE MEMBER:** Councillor E Woodburn  
**LEAD OFFICER:** Paul Walker, Chief Executive  
**REPORT AUTHOR:** Penny Mell, Head of Policy and Transformation

### **WHAT BENEFITS WILL THESE PROPOSALS BRING TO COPELAND RESIDENTS?**

We are responding to unprecedented challenges around the future role of local government, driven by a series of fundamental changes to the national policy framework and significant reductions in funding. The scale and pace of these funding reductions have forced the Council to reconsider the services it provides and make policy decisions that reflect these changes in funding. Most importantly, this means that the Council will prioritise the delivery of its statutory services over discretionary ones.

In recognising the fundamental changes taking place, we published its consultation document, “Our proposed budget savings 2013-2015 – the future role of the Council” in October last year. The document set out a range of proposals to generate £2.6M to £2.9M of cash savings, enabling the Council to set a balanced budget. In line with the Council’s overall budget strategy, the majority of these proposals related to the Council’s discretionary services. The consultation process aimed to communicate these proposals as clearly as possible and gain feedback on these options so if there was subsequent scope for the Executive to accept or reject options and still be able to recommend a balanced budget, then the feedback gained would help inform this process as well as identifying any mitigating actions that may be possible.

Subsequently, on the 19 December 2012 the Council received its settlement from Government which was worse than expected. Whilst detailed work continues on the settlement, we estimate that we need to find a further £450K in 2014/15 on top of the cash savings we proposed within our consultation document. Therefore, the feedback received from this consultation process should be read within the context of the continuing downward pressure on our income and how that points towards the importance of potential mitigations and finding alternative ways of working as a Council, with the community and with partners in order that everyone can play their role in securing outcomes for Copeland.

This report provides insight into the feedback received from the consultation process with regard to the service change options set out. It also identifies the key policy decisions that arise from this process and when taken together with the revised Corporate Plan sets the future direction of the Council – one which primarily focusses on arranging the delivery statutory services aligned with our statutory role and remit.

## **WHY HAS THIS REPORT COME TO THE EXECUTIVE?**

**(eg Key Decision, Policy recommendation for Full Council, at request of Council,etc.)**

The report refers to fundamental policy proposals which will set the future direction of the Council. It is therefore a key decision.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Council are recommended to

1. consider the potential impact of the proposed policy decisions and the mitigating actions as set out within Table 1 together with the Equality Impact Assessment as set out in Appendix B of the report; and.
2. approve the policy decisions set out within the report for which the Executive will implement.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 In 2012, the Executive recognised that the continuing reductions in Council budgets and the radical shift in national policy necessitated a fundamental review of the role of Copeland Borough Council including what it will do and what it will look like going forward into 2015 and beyond. With this recognition, the Executive commenced an intensive period of work in order to prepare a series of proposals relating to the future role of Council and the future provision of services. This work was supported by a series of Policy Development Groups examining a series of discretionary services and the work of OSC looking at car parks specifically. The whole process sought to identify savings of £2.6M to £2.9M for the period 2013-2015.
- 1.2 This work lead to the development and publication of the Council's consultation document, "Our proposed budget savings 2013-2015 – the future role of the Council". As well as setting out the Council's proposed vision, mission and priorities for the future, the document also set out the Council's overall budget strategy and a series of detailed service change options. Given the nature and scale of the proposed changes, the Council conducted an extensive consultation process of which the key messages are highlighted within this report.

## **2. CONSULTATION**

- 2.1 The Council published its consultation document in October last year and invited feedback from a range of organisations; local businesses and residents. The consultation process consisted of a range of activities designed to raise awareness of the proposals and create opportunities for residents and

others to talk to the Council about them. This included opportunities for community asset transfer and for communities and partners to talk to the Council about how the role they may have in the delivery of discretionary services in future.

2.2 This range of activities included:

- The publication of the consultation document setting out the proposals and opportunities to feedback available on the Council's website, face to face outlets and drop in sessions;
- A special edition of Copeland Matters targeted at all households throughout the Borough;
- An accompanying questionnaire (hard copy and on-line);
- A direct mail out to the Citizens' Panel;
- On-line comments facility and use of social media;
- Drop in sessions throughout the Borough at varying times and venues;
- Meetings with stakeholders and representative groups; and
- Local press coverage.

2.3 Staff were also able to take part in the consultation process. This included a number of staff briefings. As part of the process, Trade Union representatives were also regularly briefed. No formal feedback has been received.

2.4 This process running from the 10 of October to 07 of December generated the following feedback:

- 280 questionnaires were submitted
- Over 30 letters received
- Comments from participants at 10 drop in sessions held throughout the Borough
- Over 15 meetings with stakeholders
- Comments from 3 user group meetings held with regard to the Beacon, Civic and Bowls Centre.
- "Message in a bottle" activity at the Beacon.
- Activity on social media sites including a group set up on Facebook – "save the Civic-the Beacon and Tourist Info" with 1, 181 'likes' and it is estimated that 100 separate people commented against the Council's proposals in this way via around 500 comments and a further 100 messages or tweets on Twitter.

2.5 The Council also received 3 petitions. Two of these related to saving the Beacon/Tourist Information Centre and Civic Hall and one petition was received from the children, staff, parents and friends of a local school petitioning to save the Beacon.

2.6 The extensive consultation process sought to reach as many people as possible to raise awareness about the proposals and potential future impacts. The consultation process included working with some of our partners and representative stakeholders in order to reach the "hard to reach" groups. Whilst it is often the case that a relatively small number of people choose to

respond, it is hoped that the key messages about the financial situation and the difficult decisions facing the Council reached many more.

- 2.7 The consultation process provided a rich mix of both quantitative and qualitative responses. All of the feedback received has been reviewed and when taken together provides an insight into how the proposals for the future of the Council and its service change options have been received by those responding to our communication and consultation document. The key messages from this feedback have been included in this report in order to help support and inform the decision making process.

### **3. SERVICE CHANGE OPTIONS**

- 3.1 In line with its proposed corporate policy framework and the Medium Term Financial Projections, the Council consulted on a series of proposed service change options that would deliver approximately £2.6m of savings over 2013/14 and 2014/15.
- 3.2 In summary, the overall budget strategy proposed identified:
- Prioritising the future delivery of statutory services – reducing the net budget of these services by 2% (net) over the next two years;
  - Reducing the costs of running the Council by a further 22% (net) over the next two years; and
  - Stopping or reducing discretionary services in order to reduce the Council's largest area of spend by 56% (net) over the next two years.
- 3.3 The consultation document provided further details on each of these strands of the budget strategy. Feedback from the consultation process is set out below.

### **4. CONSULTATION FEEDBACK**

- 4.1 There were a number of ways in which residents and others could respond to the Council's consultation, for example, in person at drop in session, by completing the questionnaire or attending a meeting. Once the consultation closed, all of the feedback was analysed. Presented below are key messages arising from the analysis of the feedback received.
- 4.1.1 Many of those responding to the consultation recognised the financial circumstances affecting the Council. Whilst it was not a universally held view, some of those responding to the consultation recognised the austerity measures being implemented nationally and understood that changes to services would result locally. More people agreed with the Council's priorities than disagreed.

- 4.1.2 Many of those responding to the consultation agreed with the Council's proposals to reduce running costs, including: 84% of people who answered agreed with our proposals to reduce Copeland Centre accommodation costs. There were also strong levels of agreement with proposals around civic costs (including mayoralty) and ceasing some subscriptions. With regard to stopping Copeland Matters in print, 78% of people agreed with this proposal although we did receive some comments suggesting it should stay. We also had some suggestions that it could be provided in a different format e.g. as an app for a smart phone. 78% of people felt that these proposals would have little or no impact on them or their family and 61% compared with 35% felt it would have little or no impact on their local area.
- 4.1.3 Many of those responding to the consultation wanted the Council to work to mitigate the potentially negative impacts of service reductions. Many respondents empathised with the potential impacts of service reductions on others and the local area even where they didn't identify so strongly a problem for themselves or their immediate family. For example, 78% of people felt that the Beacon, tourism and arts proposals would have an impact (some or high) on the local area compared with 54% stating it would have an impact on them or their family. Within this set of proposals, there was only one area where more people tended to agree than disagree and this was with regard to arts development. We are continuing to work to find a partner to assist in the running of the Beacon in future.
- 4.1.4 With regard to our proposals regarding 'Economic, Localities and Communities', 73% of people responding felt that the proposals would have an impact (some or high) on place compared with 54% stating it would have little or no impact on them or their family. More people agreed with our proposals regarding economic and community development and sustainability. Our proposals relating to economic and community development seek to retain some capacity to influence outcomes in this area and work with communities to adapt to the changes taking place. With regard to the Discretionary Concessionary Travel Scheme, results were more mixed. 48% of people responding that identified themselves as having a disability, disagreed with our proposals. This scheme targets resources to those meeting particular criteria, including: those in receipt of DLA Higher Mobility Component. More people disagreed with the proposal to cease youth engagement (unless external funding could be found) than agreed. We have now secured external funding to help continue with this post.
- 4.1.5 With regard to the proposals relating to Parks and Open Spaces, people responding were more likely to think that these proposals would impact on them and family (67%) as well as their local area (78%). 78% of people responding disagreed with our proposals regarding public toilets, with 80% of people suggesting that it would impact on their local area. Our approach to Community Asset Transfer includes the potential to transfer public conveniences to another service provider. There are already examples within the Borough where this has happened.

More people agreed with our approach to community asset transfer than disagreed. However, the Council will need to ensure that this transfer of responsibility is conducted effectively as it will be essential that our communities understand and have confidence in this way of working.

- 4.1.6 We also put forward a number of proposals relating to our waste and recycling service. People responding felt that there was potential for these changes to have an impact their local area and themselves and their families. Whilst those responding disagreed with charging for green waste collections, the majority of people responding agreed with reduced seasonal collections for green waste (61% compared with 25% respectively). 48% of people agreed with charging for wheelie bin replacements, however, in the extensive waste service consultation undertaken last year, it was clear that for hard pressed households any form of charge in this area would be difficult to meet. More people disagreed with withdrawing the kerbside collection of plastic and cardboard (available to about a third of the Borough currently) than agreed. Promotion of 'bring to' sites as an alternative will be essential in implementing this service change in order to make sure that these materials do not find their way into mainstream (black bin) collections. At this time we are recommending that reduced seasonal collections for green waste is introduced before charging for this service and that charging for replacement wheelie bins is not introduced in 2013/14. Both measures will need to be reconsidered in 2014/15.
- 4.1.7 Throughout the consultation, those responding were given the opportunity to identify **alternative savings proposals**. One such suggestion was to increase charges for services and facilities. With regard to our proposals on fees and charging, there was general agreement to the principle that services such as taxi licensing, crematorium and cemeteries and car parking should cover their operational costs. Any changes with regard to car parking were seen to potentially impact more particularly on town centre prosperity so as might be expected opinion was more divided on this principle here. Some respondents suggested alternatives, including transferring car parks to other providers. We currently operate a small of proportion of car parks throughout the borough. However, under our Community Asset Transfer policy, non-fee paying car parks currently operated by us will be made available for transfer. Others suggested improved enforcement as a means of generating more income. Currently, we are only responsible for enforcement on our own car parks. All on-street enforcement is the responsibility of the County Council. We are also signed up to the 'Enforcement Concordat' to help ensure we enforcement responsibly.
- 4.1.8 Other alternative savings proposals included reducing the number of Elected Members (and/or allowances). Other people responding suggested developing shared services and joining forces with other councils. Some respondents suggested outsourcing services to private providers whilst others put forward suggestions around innovative partnerships with social

enterprises and health. In relation to health, this included the development of a combined budget which would assist with joint commissioning.

In the consultation process, a number of organisations and agencies identified the possibility of working with the Council to investigate how some of these alternatives might work. Whilst there would need to be a period of investment to manage a significant period of change for the Council and customers, the results of this consultation would support such an approach to future service delivery.

#### 4.1.9 Other more specific suggestions included:

- **Finding a partner to help operate the Beacon.** We are working to maintain the Beacon as a cultural facility and accredited museum for the borough and we have focused attention on finding a commercial partner to join this aspiration. Partnership discussions are underway with a timescale to set out heads of terms for a partnership agreement by April 2013.
- **Let out floor space in the Copeland Centre.** This suggestion is exactly what we are aiming to do to reduce costs of office accommodation to the Council. This will be phased to ensure the timely movement of staff and has already commenced where possible.
- **Reduce staffing costs.** The majority of costs of the day to day running of services are staff costs and the effective use of these resources has been the focus of our work over the last 2 years and will continue to be the case as we invest in IT to help streamline processes and remove unnecessary work from our process. In terms of staff contracts we are already moving to fixed term and seasonal arrangements where business need allows to reduce our overall cost. We have completed the review of senior and middle management with savings in excess of £0.6M already being made.
- **Cut red tape.** We are striving to streamline administrative processes and remove unnecessary work from the way we do things as part of changing the way we work. Increased use of IT is planned to further drive our changes, and our new website is a key part of reducing the costs helping our customers to do more on line. However, there are a number of new legislative burdens that we have to comply with and these do add to our costs for e.g. for 2012 and 2013 alone we have:-
  - new HMRC requirements on payroll,
  - new auto-enrolment procedures for pensions,
  - Under the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012, we are required to consider how we commission and procure services and change these processes,
  - Addressing and implementing the requirements of the Localism Act 2012.
  - Change our council tax scheme from a benefits scheme to a discount scheme in accordance with government requirements
  - Deal with changes to the business rate system
  - Implement on behalf of the DWP changes to housing benefit through its policy changes known as bedroom tax

- Plan for the implementation of the national universal credit system

4.1.10 Detailed results from the questionnaire are shown in Appendix A.

## **5. KEY POLICY DECISIONS**

- 5.1 In implementing these service change proposals, a number of key policy decisions will be made. These policy decisions are made within the context of the financial pressures facing the Council. These are set out in Table 1 together with potential known impacts and mitigations.
- 5.2 There are also a number of proposals which we are recommending are not progressed in the 2013/2014 budget round, although they will need to be considered again in 2014/15. These are:
- Introduction of charging for green waste collections; and
  - Introduction of charging for replacement wheelie bins.

## **6. EQUALITY IMPACT ANALYSIS**

- 6.1 Throughout the budget consultation we have sought to understand the potential impacts of these service change options. We have consulted with a number of stakeholders and groups that represent the interests of our communities. Our Full Equality Impact Assessment is set out at Appendix B. In summary we found that the protected characteristics most likely to be impacted where: age and disability:

## **7. MITIGATING ACTION PLAN**

- 7.1 These service change options represent a series of difficult decisions for the Council to take. However, given the scale and immediacy of the financial reductions and the subsequent financial forecasts going forward, it is felt that these changes are unavoidable. As part of our equality impact assessment process, we have sought to identify potential mitigating actions. We will monitor the implementation of any mitigating actions as part of our overall approach to the savings realisation programme.
- 7.2 Our proposed mitigating actions include:
- Implementation of our Community Asset Transfer Policy to support communities where possible in their aspiration to use community assets proactively to continue to deliver services.
  - Finding alternative funding arrangements for services through: partnerships; external funding and self-financing
  - Where activity programs and fees are changed these will reviewed before implementation and monitored post implementation



- Our “Be active plus” card will be maintained and developed.
- Our grants will be re-profiled to target resources in line with our new policy framework and help those most in need.
- Blue badge car parking will be maintained.
- Information about the alternatives to the Discretionary Concessionary Travel Scheme will be made available.
- As part of our Access to Services Strategy, increase the use of technology to improve access to services throughout the Borough, including: the Council’s new website; the introduction of smart phone technology; and promotion of wireless connectivity and broadband.
- As part of our Transformation Plan proactively work with others to identify and implement new ways of working particularly where this will help us reduce our overheads costs.
- As part of our Transformation Plan, implement new ways of working that help us reduce the underlying costs of providing services so as to help sustain the delivery of services into the future, including, for example: reducing processing times; implementing agile working methods and supporting self-service by customers.
- We will continue to monitor comments and complaints and improve the monitoring of service user profiles regardless of who provides the service.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 Since 2010 the Council has been implementing a savings programme. In the first two years of this programme, the Council has focused on efficiency savings whilst protecting front line services as far as possible. The continuing scale and pace of savings required however has resulted in the Council reviewing its overall budget strategy giving rise to the service change options set out within this report.
- 8.2 In order to set a balanced budget, the Council will need to commence with the implementation of these savings measures immediately and put in place a series of measures to mitigate where possible. These mitigation measures point towards the future of the organisation, where the continued downward pressure on finances in Local Government, will mean that Council will need to work in a very different way if customer expectations are to be met, overhead costs reduced and business continuity achieved.

## **9. STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMENTS**

- 9.1 The Monitoring Officer’s comments are: Proposals for policy changes are appropriate and proportionate in context of reducing local authority resources and need to concentrate on statutory functions and partnership approaches to service delivery. Report sets out likely impacts of policy decisions with associated mitigating measures.
- 9.2 The Section 151 Officer’s comments are:

The recent financial settlement from Government and the wider impact of austerity on the Council has led to a fundamental review of the role of the Council. The budget strategy recognised the need to focus resources on effective delivery of the services the Council has a legal duty to provide. This has meant that in order to balance its budget, the Council need to focus changes on the discretionary elements of current provision, reducing both its role and funding in the future. The aim is that communities and partners will find different ways of doing things and 'stepping into the space' that the Council is having to leave, whether through new arrangements or finding new sources of financing or ensuring that changes cover the full cost of provision.

The new policy framework will drive all future spending decisions and allocation of resources and help provides a clear and accountable set of criteria for revenue and capital investment in future.

### 9.3 Policy Framework comments:

This report identifies the key policy decisions arising from the service change options. This, taken together with revised Corporate Plan, for the Council will form the new corporate policy framework for the Council 2013/14 onwards.

We will continue to monitor the framework to ensure that it is affordable and remains fit for purpose.

### 9.4 EIA Comments: Full EIA attached.

## **10. HOW WILL THE PROPOSALS BE PROJECT MANAGED AND HOW ARE THE RISKS GOING TO BE MANAGED?**

- 10.1 We have established a Change Management Board which has developed and oversees the Council's Transformation Programme. The realisation of the savings associated with the service change options presented within this report together with the enabling works form part of this programme. Senior Responsible Officers will be responsible, with support from the Board, to implement the service change options described within this report. The Transformation Team will be responsible for working with the Senior Responsible Officers and the Board to design and put in place the relevant supporting initiatives. The Board will receive regular exception reports and the Executive will receive regular reports through the finance and transformation functions.

## **11. WHAT MEASURABLE OUTCOMES OR OUTPUTS WILL ARISE FROM THIS REPORT?**

- 11.1 The development and delivery of the Council's savings realisation programme with the appropriate support which is required in order to allow the Council to set a balanced budget.

Appendix A – Analysis of questionnaire responses – frequencies

Appendix B – Full EIA

**List of Background Documents:**

“A consultation on: our proposed budget savings 2013-2015 and the future role of the Council” public consultation document.

**TABLE 1 KEY POLICY DECISIONS**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
1 Statutory	We will prioritise statutory services ensuring that they are adequately funded and we will continue to invest in them to maximise efficiency and effectiveness.	Statutory services will continue to be provided but will be required to change service design and delivery methods in accordance with the Council's access to services work and wider transformation plan.	These services will be supported through the Council's Transformation Plan to deliver up to a further 2% efficiency savings whilst maintaining service standards. We will ensure that our customer service standards reflect relevant legal requirements and over and above that customer preferences where possible.
2 Discretionary	We recognise the importance of arts to the local area, however, with the funding to local government significantly reduced we will no longer directly fund the promotion and delivery of Arts but leave this funded to do so.	We will no longer employ a Arts Development Officer. We will no longer grant aid arts organisations. We will no longer offer a development service to arts organisations.	Where grants are stopped, this will be in accordance with the grants review process. We will re-negotiate our relationship with the Arts Council and Heritage Lottery Fund. Our community regeneration activity will work with locality priorities and Copeland Community Fund team will assist community fundraising activity with community based arts groups.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
3 Discretionary	We will no longer provide or directly fund dedicated Tourist Information Centres and grants to tourism activity. We understand that tourism is an important part of diversifying the local economy so we will continue to support tourism through our partnership to sustain the Beacon Museum.	The Tourist Information Centre in Whitehaven will close. We will no longer grant aid Tourist Information Centres or tourism activity. We will remain on the West Cumbria Tourism Partnership if this is cost neutral for the Council.	We will seek to provide tourist information in different ways, including via the web. We are working with local bodies who are seeking further information on what options they may have for taking up tourist information activity and in Whitehaven and Egremont having an independent accredited TIC function within existing activity. Tourist information is likely to be kept and even enhanced within existing provision in Millom Folk Museum, Lowes Court Gallery and a range of locally accessible venues and facilities in Whitehaven including the Sports Centre.
4 Discretionary	We will no longer directly provide public conveniences.	We will close our public conveniences. We will signpost to alternative outlets.	These assets will be transferred to partners and local communities under our revised Community Asset Transfer Policy. We will sign-post communities to relevant help and support. We will work with communities to understand and have confidence in this approach.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
5 Discretionary	We will no longer provide or fund community sports activities.	We will no longer employ Sports Development Officers. We will no longer provide activities associated with this team including: free school holiday sports and activity programme; working with local sports clubs; and the provision of small grants.	There are other organisations in Cumbria that offer sports development support and advice. Grants are available from other sources including fundraising support from the Copeland Community Fund team. Conversations are being held with West Lakes College and the two Copeland Sports Partnerships to encourage local clubs to pick up the co-ordination of this activity previously undertaken by the Council.
6 Discretionary	We will reduce our subsidy to our leisure contract.	We will reduce our subsidy and look to close some facilities. Prices may go up and the programme of activities may change significantly.	We will work with others to seek alternatives for the Whitehaven Civic Hall and Cleator Bowls Centre. We will work with our current contractor to review any proposed changes to the Sports Centre and Pool before they are implemented to assess any potential impacts and to identify opportunities to maintain the Bowls Centre within the current contract with no subsidy for operation or maintenance. We will continue to prioritise and protect the “Be Active” Plus Card.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
7 Discretionary	We will cease our sustainability function but retain our commitment to reducing our carbon footprint and supporting the affordable warmth programme.	We will reduce our work in this area and focus on energy efficiency within our own property portfolio and support to the affordable warmth scheme.	We will continue with our programme of energy efficiency which will be delivered by the Property Team in line with available budgets and resources. We will continue to support the Affordable Warmth Programme which will be located within the Strategic Housing Team.
8 Discretionary	We will stop providing the Discretionary Concessionary Travel Scheme.	We will no longer provide the Discretionary Concessionary Travel Scheme.	We will provide information on the alternatives which include, for example the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) (provides free off peak travel on scheduled bus services for people of pensionable age and people with disabilities NoWcard) and the Healthcare Travel Costs Scheme for those on a low income (criteria apply).

Reference	Policy Decision	Potential Impact	Mitigations
9 Discretionary	We will protect and develop the “BeActive Plus” Card.	We will assist those on lower incomes to access relevant leisure facilities through the provision of the “BeActive Plus” card.	We will ensure the “Be Active Plus” is maintained as a core priority of the negotiations and resulting revised contract arrangement with the contractor.
10 Discretionary	We will no longer collect green waste over the winter period.	We will suspend the collection of green waste over the winter months. Analysis of green waste tonnages collected show there is a significant fall off outside of the gardening season and as such specific mitigation for most residents is unnecessary, however residents will, continue, to be signposted to the benefits of home composting – reduced carbon footprint and useful by-product.	We will communicate this change to our customers in advance of it taking place. The contact centre staff will be briefed in order to help customers if necessary. We will monitor customer satisfaction.
11 Enhanced statutory	We will no longer collect plastic and cardboard as part of the kerbside collection scheme (only available in about a third of the Borough currently).	We will withdraw the kerbside plastic and cardboard recycling service, currently available to about a third of the Borough. .	We will continue to provide ‘bring to’ sites for the collection of plastic and cardboard. The Council will seek to identify and, if practical, plug gaps in the spacial provision of plastic and cardboard bring banks. We will monitor tonnage collected.



<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigations</b>
12 Discretionary	We will align our grant scheme with our budget and new policy framework.	Those organisations currently in receipt of grants have been consulted on the proposed principles underpinning future grants. We will provide a minimum notification period to those organisations losing their grant from the Council. We will ensure all grants have rigorous SLAs and in some instances providers will be moved to contracts.	Other sources of funding are available to organisations within the Borough affected by the grants review along with specific community fundraising assistance on sources from the Copeland Community Fund Team and other local partners including Cumbria CVS. The Copeland Community Fund has been very successful at both giving small grants under £50,000 and over £3,000 with match funding of 3 to 1.
13 Discretionary & statutory	We will maximise income from fees and charges looking to move discretionary services to a self financing position where they cover their costs including overheads.  For those we have a statutory duty for a fee we will ensure these comply with relevant regulations or self finance.	We will increase our fees for taxi licensing; cemeteries and crematorium; and car parking. We will increase our fees for maintaining and inspecting play areas. We will look at other areas where we may be able to introduce or increase charging.	Off street blue badge car parking will remain.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigations</b>
14 Discretionary	We will cease the provision of street furniture over time by removing items as they come to the end of their life.	The visual amenity of our street scene will change over time. There will be less places provided by the Council for people to sit. The reduction in street 'clutter' may make streets more accessible to those with reduced visibility or mobility.	Other organisations may choose to provide or sponsor such facilities.
15 Discretionary	We will seek external funding in order to maintain the youth engagement post.	Only by securing external funding will the work of the Youth Engagement Officer be able to continue. If this post is discontinued this will impact on our ability to sustain the youth forums and other activities which enable young people to participate and influence decisions.	We have secured 75% match revenue funding for this Officer for three years i.e. till March 2016.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigations</b>
16 Discretionary	We will cease funding the provision of CCTV.	In line with current Police priorities, we will cease the provision of CCTV.	<p>We will continue with our support to LMAPS.</p> <p>We will continue to support MARAC.</p> <p>We will continue as a centre for Hate Crime reporting.</p> <p>We will continue, until a formal decision is taken, our support to the Community Safety Partnership.</p> <p>CCTV is provided in some business premises and incidents are frequently captured using mobile phone technology providing police investigators with a wider range of options than was the case when CCTV systems were originally introduced. The existing CCTV assets owned by the Council will be offered to the Police should they wish to continue to use the system.</p>
17 Discretionary	We will seek alternative arrangements for the provision of Christmas lights in Whitehaven and Cleator Moor.	There is potential impact on the two town centers in terms of the Christmas shopping 'attraction'.	Experience at Millom and Egremont has shown when the Council's lighting assets are transferred to more local organisation significant improvements can be achieved. For a time limited period the assets and some match funding will be provided to organisations interested in delivering Christmas lights in Whitehaven and Cleator Moor.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigations</b>
18 Discretionary	We will cut open spaces, grass verges and greens less frequently, stop maintaining sports pitches and reduce our maintenance of allotments.	Residents will notice areas of long grass during the growing season. The condition of some common areas of allotments may deteriorate. Similarly non-leased pitches will become unsuitable for competition matches.	Reduce frequency cuts will continue. We will monitor for any adverse impacts on littering. We will consider allotments under our Community Asset Transfer policy and encourage allotment associations to take greater control over common areas. The few remaining sports pitches not leased to clubs will be made available for lease, again experience shows when transferred to club level management significant improvements can be achieved because new funding sources become available.
19 Discretionary	We will stop providing the majority of shrub beds and flower displays in the Borough and continue to maintain some where our costs are covered by partners or others.	We will remove the majority of shrub and flower beds which may impact on the visual amenity of the Borough.	We will look for alternative ways of working to maintain at least some of these, particularly encouraging Friends Groups, other community groups and Town and Parish Council's to have a greater local involvement.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigations</b>
20 Discretionary	We will continue with our contribution to Copeland's Locality Partnerships and locality officer's team in order to help build and sustain capacity within communities to identify and meet their own needs.	There is in place a time limited arrangement to help build capacity within communities.	We will work within localities to help build and sustain capacity within communities to identify and meet their own needs. We will proactively support Community Asset Transfer. We have published our local Community Right to Bid and Community Right to Challenge policies.
21 Discretionary	We will end our contribution to Joint Neighbourhood Forums administered by the County Council.	We may no longer be able to participate in the decisions that are made at local area committees regarding the distribution of their grants.	There are a number of very small funds available locally including the Cumbria Community Foundation. County, Copeland Community Fund and other VCS partners are able to assist with signposting.

Reference	Policy Decision	Potential Impact	Mitigations
22 Discretionary	We will deliver an integrated team approach to corporate economic development and locality based community regeneration and reduce activity budgets to enable regeneration projects.	We will continue to work on attracting external funding in partnership with others. Council capacity for this activity will be reduced and directly aligned to our strategic priorities and available resources.	The council is one of the core owners of the Britain's Energy Coast Partnership and will continue to use its influencing and enabling role to maximise BEC resources to deliver against the priorities of the West Cumbria Economic Blueprint in Copeland. We will work with project partners to transfer project leads from the Council to other appropriate agencies to enable continuity of benefit to our residents eg youth apprentice schemes
23 Discretionary	We will reduce our subsidy to the Beacon seeking a partnership arrangement by 2014 and closing it if that isn't possible.	Opening times at the Beacon will reduce. The partnership agreement will set out the strategy, implementation and future operational framework for the Beacon. The impact of the new partnership on current community use may result in loss of some existing community facilities at the Beacon.	A partnership agreement to be in place by April 2013 to enable the partnership delivery by April 2014. A project plan to enable the partnership development, mitigations, risk management and transition arrangements is in place to enable an integrated approach to the partnership Beacon. Transition and exit strategies are to be put in place for existing users impacted on by change of resources and operation. Negotiations to transfer archive and library materials on deposit to other archive facilities in Whitehaven are underway.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Policy Decision</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigations</b>
24 Discretionary	Activities associated with the nuclear industry over and above the Council's statutory functions will be cost neutral to the Council.	We will maintain our core input but this may impact on our ability to respond in a timely way to national waste consultations and policy development.	We will work with partners to support our continued input into the nuclear agenda and seek further funding opportunities.
25 Discretionary	Reduce the number of events and activities hosted from the Mayoral office.	Less events and activities throughout the year.	The mayoral will be supported to lead four civic events per year with a small cash budget which will be frozen at 2013/14 levels.
26 Discretionary	We will cease some subscriptions	This could potentially impact upon our wider professional networks and the ability of officers to benefit from sharing best practice and learning from others.	The most important subscriptions will be maintained.
27 Discretionary	We will stop producing Copeland Matters in print.	There may be an impact on the Council's ability to communicate directly with its customers.	The Council's website will be used more. The Council's Face to Face locations will be used more. The Council will aim to implement smart phone technology as a communications method. We will work with our partners to cascade information. We will run campaign's on key issues throughout the year to target our communications more.

Reference	Policy Decision	Potential Impact	Mitigations
28 Discretionary	We will reduce the cost of the Copeland Centre accommodation.	<p>We will have less staff permanently based within the Copeland Centre.</p> <p>We will have staff spending more time delivering services and less time travelling.</p> <p>We will reduce our business mileage costs.</p> <p>We will increase the number of services that can be delivered seamlessly.</p>	<p>We will introduce mobile working arrangements in order to support our wider accommodation plan which will see increased letting of the floor space available in the Copeland Centre.</p> <p>We will increase the use of our website for the take-up of services.</p> <p>We will increase the use of the contact centre for accessing services.</p>
29 Business Basics	We will continue to reduce the cost of running the council.	<p>Staff and customers will be asked to transact with us differently. This will include increasing use of self-service.</p> <p>We will need to communicate with customers and Elected Members throughout the change process so that customers know how to access service differently.</p>	<p>We will promote the use of the Council's website to access information and services.</p> <p>We will look to support the increased provision of broadband and wireless throughout the Borough.</p> <p>We will promote the use of smart phone apps for the delivery of services and access to information.</p> <p>We will invest in technology to automate processes within the organisation.</p> <p>We will work with others to help reduce our running costs and ensure business continuity.</p> <p>We will support staff through our organisational development process.</p>



## APPENDIX A - Analysis of questionnaire responses – frequencies

Question – Policy questions	Tend to or strongly agree	Tend to or strongly disagree
Statutory services: How strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to statutory services? - <b>Statutory services</b>	52%	20%
How strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to reducing the running costs of the council? - <b>Reducing the running costs of the council</b>	85%	8%
How strongly do you agree/disagree, with our proposed policy on community asset transfer? - <b>Community asset transfer</b>	51%	19%
How strongly do you agree/disagree with our proposed <b>priorities</b> for the future?	55%	29%

### A. Analysis of potential impact on Local Area ranked in order (highest first)

Question	Some or high impact	Low or no impact whatsoever
Thinking about these proposals, what impact do you think these will have? - On your local area - <b>Public Toilets</b>	80%	18%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>waste and recycling</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	80%	17%
Thinking about these proposals for the <b>Beacon, tourism and arts</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	78%	21%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>parks and open spaces</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	78%	20%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>increasing car parking charges</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	78%	19%
Thinking about these proposals <b>for sports and leisure</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	77%	21%
Thinking about these proposals what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area - <b>Economic, Localities and Communities</b>	73%	23%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>sports and health development</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	68%	29%

Thinking about these proposals for <b>increasing crematorium and cemetery fees</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	66%	31%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>increasing taxi licence fees</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	60%	37%
Thinking about these proposals for the <b>Civic and Corporate savings</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On your local area	35%	61%

B. Analysis of potential impact on You on Your Family ranked in order (highest first)

Question	Some or high impact	Low or no impact whatsoever
Thinking about these proposals for <b>waste and recycling</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	71%	26%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>parks and open spaces</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	67%	30%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>increasing car parking charges</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	66%	31%
Thinking about these proposals, what impact do you think these will have? - On you and your family - Public Toilets	63%	35%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>sports and leisure</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	56%	41%
Thinking about these proposals for the <b>Beacon, tourism and arts</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	54%	45%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>increasing crematorium and cemetery fees</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	52%	44%
Thinking about these proposals what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family - <b>Economic, Localities and Communities</b>	41%	54%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>sports and health development</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	39%	58%
Thinking about these proposals for <b>increasing taxi licence fees</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	31%	65%

Thinking about these proposals for the <b>Civic and Corporate savings</b> , what impact do you think these proposals will have? - On you and your family	18%	78%
--	-----	-----

C. Analysis of responses – strength of agreement/disagreement.

<b>Question – Beacon, tourism and arts</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly agree</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly disagree</b>
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>The Beacon</b>	35%	52%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Tourist Information Centres</b>	30%	58%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Arts Development</b>	42%	31%

<b>Question – sports and leisure</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly agree</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly disagree</b>
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Whitehaven Civic Hall</b>	26%	60%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Copeland Bowls and Sports Centre (Cleator Moor)</b>	31%	45%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Copeland Pool</b>	28%	58%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Whitehaven Sports Centre</b>	28%	58%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Ceasing Sports and health development</b>	32%	50%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - Sports and Health Development: <b>Review provision of associated grants</b>	32%	50%

<b>Question – economic development, localities and communities</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly agree</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly disagree</b>
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Economic and Community Development</b>	43%	36%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Sustainability</b>	38%	30%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Youth Engagement</b>	33%	42%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Discretionary Concessionary Travel Scheme</b>	41%	35%

<b>Question – parks and open spaces</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly agree</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly disagree</b>
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Grounds maintenance</b>	29%	57%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Street furniture</b>	35%	44%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Christmas lights</b>	41%	40%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>CCTV</b>	33%	52%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Closing public toilets</b>	16%	78%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Review provision of grants</b>	36%	42%

<b>Question – waste and recycling</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly agree</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly disagree</b>
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Green waste charges</b>	28%	58%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Green waste reduced seasonal collection</b>	61%	25%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Charging for replacement wheelie bins</b>	48%	35%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Stop kerbside collection of plastic and cardboard</b>	35%	48%

<b>Question – civic and corporate savings</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly agree</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly disagree</b>
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Reduce the mayoral budget</b>	86%	4%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Cease some subscriptions</b>	80%	2%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Stopping Copeland Matters in print</b>	78%	11%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to <b>Civic Hospitality</b>	86%	7%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Grants</b>	53%	19%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to these services? - <b>Reduce Copeland Centre accommodation costs</b>	84%	3%

<b>Question – fees and charges</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly agree</b>	<b>Tend to or strongly disagree</b>
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to ensuring that the charges for these services should cover the whole cost of running the service? – <b>Taxi</b>	69%	13%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to ensuring that the charges for these services should cover the whole cost of running the service? - <b>Car parking</b>	41%	44%
Thinking about these proposals, how strongly do you agree/disagree with our approach to ensuring that the charges for these services should cover the whole cost of running the service? – <b>Crematorium and Cemeteries</b>	51%	32%

## Copeland Borough Council Full Equality Impact Assessment – Budget Proposals 2013/15

***The Council has taken steps to ensure that equality and diversity is an intrinsic part of the budget development process. Prior to public consultation, an initial summary EIA was completed against the budget proposals 2013/15. The initial EIA identified the potential anticipated impacts of the proposals on protected characteristic groups using the service user data available. It should be noted that the availability of data is proportionate to the service delivered. It is also important to note that the equality duties do not prevent public authorities from making difficult decisions such as service reorganisations and reductions, nor do they stop public authorities from making decisions which may affect one group more than another.***

An EIA helps determine whether and in what way service changes or strategies/policies have a disproportionate impact on people holding different protected characteristics. EIAs determine the impact of a policy, service or function on equality groups with the aim of identifying any mitigating actions and any opportunities to promote equality and diversity.

EIAs help to ensure that decisions – including financial decisions - are fair, transparent and accountable and consider the needs of different people and groups in Copeland. EIAs are based on the ‘protected characteristics’ outlined in the Equality Act 2010. These are:

- Disability
- Race
- Gender
- Sexual Orientation
- Gender Reassignment
- Age
- Religion and Belief
- Pregnancy and Maternity
- Marriage and Civil Partnership

EIAs demonstrate our compliance with requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010). The Public Sector Equality Duty states that a public authority – Copeland Borough Council – must in the exercise of its functions, has due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it.

The consultation process included a range of different activities in order to provide the maximum opportunity for involvement and feedback. This range of activities included:

- The publication of the consultation document setting out the proposals and opportunities to feedback;
- A special edition of Copeland Matters to households throughout the Borough;
- An accompanying questionnaire (hard copy and on-line);
- A direct mail out to the Citizens' Panel;
- On-line comments facility and use of social media;
- Drop in sessions throughout the Borough at varying times and venues; and
- Meetings and correspondence with stakeholders and representative groups including the following:
  - AWAZ
  - Outreach Cumbria
  - Copeland Disability Forum
  - Blue Skies
  - West House
  - Copeland Youth Council
  - Joint Churches



Other stakeholder and representative groups were contacted but did not respond.

A number of equality groups responded to the consultation and provided useful feedback. While the feedback did not specifically identify any disproportionate impacts arising from the proposals, it did provide insight into potential service design and delivery issues. This feedback will be considered and addressed as part of our wider Corporate and Service Planning processes.

The Full EIA is based on the feedback arising from both the public consultation and service data which has been analysed to identify potential equality and diversity implications and whether any disproportionate impacts on any protected characteristic are anticipated. It is important to note that the feedback consists of self-reported data, with the EIA focusing on how respondents considered the proposals would impact on themselves and their families.

### **Copeland Equality Profile (Source: Census 2011 & Cumbria Intelligence Observatory)**

Copeland has a population of 70,600. The key demographics relevant to this EIA are as follows:

#### **Disability**

20.4% of residents in Copeland have a limiting long term illness. This is above the national average of 17.9%. 26% of consultation respondents identified themselves as having a disability, which is slightly higher than the Copeland profile. Overall, this protected characteristic group indicated that it would be more likely to feel the impact of proposed waste service changes.

#### **Race**

97.2% of Copeland's population is White English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/ British compared to 92% of consultation respondents. Overall, there is no disproportionate impact anticipated on this protected characteristic group.

## **Gender**

Census 2011 shows Copeland's male/female population is 50% male and 50% female. Of the consultation respondents, 46% were female, 51% were male and 3% preferred not to say. Overall, females said they would be more likely to feel the impact of proposals on parks and open spaces.

## **Sexual Orientation**

Most recent data highlights that 74% of Copeland's population is heterosexual compared to 3% who are either homosexual or bisexual. The sexual orientation of a further 23% was not disclosed or specified. Of the consultation respondents, 88% identified themselves as heterosexual, 11% preferred not to say and just under 1% identified themselves as LGBT. Overall there is no disproportionate impact anticipated on this protected characteristic group.

## **Age**

Copeland has an aging population. Census 2011 data highlighted there are 13,354 over 65s in Copeland. This accounts for 17% of Copeland's population. The majority of respondents to the public consultation were aged 45-64 (39%) followed by 25-44 at 25%. 22% of respondents were between 65-74 followed by 8% aged 75+. 3% of respondents were aged 16-24 with 3% preferring not to say. Overall, those aged 16-24 were most likely to disagree with the proposals generally and say that they would have some or high impact.

## **Religion and Belief**

Christianity is followed by 79% of Copeland's population. 15% have no religion and 6% were unidentified in their religion. Of the consultation respondents 65% identified themselves as Christian, 24% said they had no religion, 9% preferred not to say, 2% identified themselves as

having another religion and 1% identified their religion as Buddhism. Overall there is no disproportionate impact anticipated on this protected characteristic group.

## Marriage and Civil Partnership

Among Copeland residents:

30% are single  
51% are married  
2% are separated  
9% are divorced  
8% are widowed

108 respondents to Census 2011 said they were in civil partnerships in Copeland. Of consultation respondents, 62% said they were married or separated, 13% said they were single, 8% live with partner, 5% said they were divorced and a further 5% preferred not to say. Overall there is no disproportionate impact anticipated impact on this group.

Broadly speaking the consultation respondent demographic is very similar to the overall profile of Copeland.

### **Full Summary EIA – Overall Potential Impact of Budget Proposals 2012/13**

**The potential impact of proposed policy changes and service change options have been reassessed using the feedback captured from the consultation process. Where no disproportionate impact is anticipated, this would continue to be monitored where a proposal is implemented. The impact on the Council's staff profile will be monitored as part of the Council's approach to change management and is therefore not included within this EIA.**

No.	Budget Proposals by Service Area	Summary of Impact on Protected Characteristics Groups	Mitigating Actions (if any)	Officer
-----	----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------	---------

1	<b>Beacon, Tourism and the Arts</b> - In relation to Beacon, Tourism and the Arts proposals overall. Those people aged 16-24 and 24-44 were more likely to state the proposals would have an impact on them and their families (63% and 70% respectively).			
a)	<b>The Beacon</b>  Reduce the cost of operating the Beacon by:  Reducing opening hours by April 2013  Stop funding educational and cultural event s  Only funding exhibitions and only offer these if they are self-financing  Reduce the advice and support the Beacon gives to other museums in Copeland  Closing the Beacon entirely to the public by April 2014 unless a partner is found to work with us to develop and run the facility	An analysis of the feedback received shows High impact on the following age groups:  16-24 (63% compared to 38%) 25-44 (70% compared to 30%)  Those aged 16-24 were most likely to disagree with the proposals.  Based on this information and our data about Beacon service users, it is likely that the proposals may affect children and young people.  A petition of 103 signatures from Children, Staff Parents and Friends of Orgill school to keep the Beacon open was received supporting this conclusion.  It should also be noted that the Copeland Disability Forum gave feedback that it advises the museum on accessibility and exhibitions.  It is not considered that there would be any further potential disproportionate impact on any other protected characteristic group. (It should be noted that	From April 2013, we will continue to operate the beacon with reduced opening hours to ensure that residents and visitors of all ages can continue to enjoy it whilst cost savings are made.  We will also actively explore whether the Beacon can be run commercially or in partnership to secure its long term future.  Where funding can be found educational events and exhibitions will be offered.	Julie Betteridge

		the impact of the proposals are in line with the service user profile of the Beacon).		
b)	<b>Tourist Information Centres</b>  Close Whitehaven Tourist Information Centre and review provision of grant funding to other Tourist Information Centres	It is not anticipated that there would be any disproportionate impact on any protected characteristic group.	Investigate other ways of delivering tourist information. For example this could include the Beacon and other tourism destinations in Copeland and Cumbria.	Julie Betteridge
c)	Arts Development  No longer provide an arts development service directly  Review provision of grants in this area.	An analysis of the feedback shows 63% of 16-24 year olds disagreed with our proposed approach to art development.  In 2011/12 the Arts Development Service supported 1494 Arts based events with 35964 participants.  The council also provides grant funding to a number of arts organisations, a number of which have formed strong partnerships with local youth organisations, local schools and colleges. (Prism) Arts groups indicate that as a result of the proposals, there could be a potential disproportionate impact on the age protected characteristic. This is a result of the	A range of other providers are involved in Arts provision which CBC will signpost people to.  As part of the wider approach to the provision of grants, the council has carried out a full review writing to all grant recipients directly explaining the proposals and the reason for them. Reducing grants in some	Julie Betteridge

		<p>work they carry out closely with children and younger people across the Borough.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that there would be any disproportionate impact on other protected characteristic group.</p>	<p>areas will enable the council to continue to target limited resources to organisations that support the delivery of the council's key priorities.</p>	
<p><b>2 Sports and Leisure Facilities</b> – Overall those aged 16-24 and 25 -44 were more likely to state that the proposals would have low or no impact on them or their families.</p>				
a)	<p>Close Whitehaven Civic Hall by November 2013 unless a partner can be found to operate it without subsidy</p>	<p>An analysis of the consultation feedback shows 88% of 16-24 year olds and 71% of 25-44 disagreed with the proposals relating to the Civic Hall.</p> <p>Our records show that the Civic Hall received 61,372 bookings in 2011-12 from a wide variety of people and groups who use it for a range of purposes such as weight loss clubs, leisure and other interest groups. Based on this information it is likely that the closure of the Civic Hall would impact on all users irrespective of their equality group e.g the impact would mirror the make-up of the individuals and groups that use it.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that there would be any disproportionate impact on other protected characteristic group.</p>	<p>We are exploring alternative delivery arrangements so that the Civic Hall can continue without subsidy from the Council. We will continue to operate the Civic Hall on a caretaker only basis from April 2013 to allow reasonable time to search for a partner.</p> <p>We will sign post users of civic hall to alternative community venues.</p>	<p>Julie Betteridge</p>

b)	<p>Close Cleator Moor Bowls and Sports Centre by April 2013 unless a partner can be found to operate it without subsidy (which may include Community Asset Transfer)</p>	<p>An analysis of the feedback highlighted that people aged 45–64 and 65-74 were the most likely to say the proposals would have some or high impact on them and their families.</p> <p>The centre currently provides a number of activities including Bowls fitness and dance classes and Moor Active sessions. The centre also hosts two function suites and a cafe. Timetabled events include Men's Pairs and Ladies Pairs as well as junior sessions. There are 247 members of the Bowls Club.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that there would be any disproportionate impacts on other protected characteristic group.</p>	<p>Discussions are on-going with North Country Leisure who operate the centre about they can keep it open with a reduced subsidy. This may for example include intro a small increase in the charge for users of the centre to enable it to continue to stay open. During the drop in sessions most people who expressed concerns about the bowling club proposals confirmed that they would rather pay something than see the facility closed.</p>	Julie Betteridge
c)	<p>Reduce our subsidy to Copeland Swimming Pool</p>	<p>An analysis of the feedback indicates that people between aged 16 -24 and 25-44 were more likely to disagree with the proposals than others.</p> <p>The Copeland Pool is operated with a subsidy by NCL. It is open to all visitors and resident in Copeland. As well as a standard weekly schedule, the Copeland pool also runs half term holiday and term time programmes. It</p>	<p>We will seek to protect and develop the Beactive Plus Card which offers discounts to various groups to enable specific groups to access sports and leisure facilities.</p>	Julie Betteridge

		<p>provides a wide ranging programme of swimming sessions as well as providing facilities for groups including Sasra and Copeland ASC . Children’s parties are also provided. Specialist sessions include children’s lessons, fun and inflatable sessions, sessions for babies, toddlers and parents, school lessons, aqua natal sessions, adult only and ladies only sessions.</p> <p>Most up to date user analysis shows that overall, most pool users are young people (under 17) with an average of 1550 attendances per week. A high proportion of these junior users don’t hold Be active cards.</p> <p>Of all cardholder swimming attendances 64% are female and 36% are male. Of female cardholders, 10% are 17 and under and 21% are 66 and over. Of male cardholders 15% are 17 and under and 20% are 66 and over. Overall 11.5% are 17 and under and 20% are 66 and over.</p> <p>The highest catchment areas for the swimming pool are the following postcodes:-CA28, CA25 and CA22.</p> <p>It is considered there are no further disproportionate impacts anticipated on other protected characteristics.</p>	<p>We will monitor changes to programming and pricing.</p> <p>Discussions are on-going with NCL to offset the reductions in subsidy which minimise the impact on all users of the pool.</p>	
d)	Reduce our subsidy to Whitehaven Sports Centre	<p>Whitehaven Sports Centre provides a range of activities including exercise classes, gym, sports hall and squash. It also provides the Healthy and Active Life Scheme – the former is based on GP and Practice Nurse referral</p>	<p>Protect and develop the Beactive Card Plus Card which offers discounts to various groups to enable</p>	Julie Betteridge



		<p>as well as self-referral. There are also specified activities for children with term time and half term programmes. These include Beactive Tots (under 4s), Beactive Tots (5-7s) and Beactive Klub (8+). There is also a dedicated Jungle Jack's session for children with special needs. A crèche is provided for parents of children aged between 8 weeks and 5 years.</p> <p>Available data is based on fitness card holders. We know that 61% of card holders are female and 39% are male. In terms of age, 3.6% are under 17 and 2.3% are over 66. The age largest age groups are 36-45 (28.7%) followed by 26-35 (25.3%).</p> <p>The highest catchment areas for the Sport Centre are the following postcodes:CA28 and CA25.</p> <p>The feedback indicates that people between 16-24 and 25-44 were more likely to disagree with the proposals.</p> <p>It is considered there are no further disproportionate impacts anticipated on other protected characteristic groups.</p>	<p>specific groups to access sports and leisure facilities.</p> <p>We will monitor changes to programming and pricing.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Sports and Health Development</b> – Overall those aged 16-24 were more likely to state that the proposals would have some or a high impact on them and their families.			
a)	Cease the provision of our sports and health development work and community support and review the	The Council currently employs a team which works to deliver a number of activities across the borough including free school holiday sports and activity	We will seek alternative providers.	Julie Betteridge

	<p>provision of associated grants.</p>	<p>programmes for children.</p> <p>The most recent holiday programme was attended by 922 young people, 60% boys and 40% girls.</p> <p>They also organise the Children's Abled and Disabled Sports (CADS) festival - specialist activity for disabled and able bodied 5-19 year olds to attend holiday activities together. 59 children attended the most recent CADS, of which 37 (63%) had a Special Educational Need.</p> <p>Current available data shows the team have worked with 108 sports clubs in the Borough and have supported 33 teams to achieve Clubmark status.</p> <p>The proposals could lead to an alternative provider running the programmes and this could lead to new programming and possible charging.</p> <p>The consultation feedback highlighted that people aged 16-24 were more likely to disagree with the proposals. The feedback also indicated that it would be this age group that felt the highest impact.</p> <p>It is considered there are no further disproportionate impacts anticipated on other protected characteristic groups.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

4	<b>Economic and Community Development</b> – Overall those aged 16-44 were more likely to state that the proposals would have high or some impact on them or their families (88%)
---	--

a)	<p>Reduce the size of the team</p> <p>Reduce the scope of the service but maintain a commitment to both locality support and a small core of strategic regeneration activity</p> <p>Stop directly delivering work and skills projects like Copeland Apprentice Initiative and get partners to deliver without the Council's input</p> <p>Stop funding and reduce our activity on business engagement and expect other bodies to deliver this more than at present.</p> <p>Reduce our capacity to help groups and regeneration projects develop and bid for funding.</p> <p>To cease providing youth engagement support</p>	<p>Analysis of the feedback shows that people aged 16-24 were more likely to disagree with the overall proposals. It also indicated that this age group said it would feel the highest impact of the proposal (88% felt it would have a high impact compared to 12% who thought it would have low or no impact).</p> <p>A range of projects, initiatives and community groups are supported by the current teams. There would be potential impact as a result of changes in the current service.</p> <p>Our dedicated Youth Engagement Officer supported 232 young people between April 2012 and August 2012 and worked with several groups including the Copeland Youth Council, the North East Copeland Youth Forum, the West Copeland Youth Forum, Howgate and Distington Youth Forum, Mid Copeland Youth Forum and South Copeland Youth Forum. 88% of 16-24 year olds disagreed with the proposals in relation to youth engagement support.</p> <p>It is considered there are no further disproportionate impacts anticipated on other protected characteristic groups.</p>	<p>A revised set of priorities taking into account community needs has been established to ensure the reduced resources and size of the team are focused in the areas that the community most needs</p> <p>We will continue to work with high priority regeneration initiatives that support the continued growth of Copeland.</p> <p>We will work in partnership with key regeneration partnerships to influence outcomes.</p> <p>We will seek external funding support to support youth engagement support and maintain the current level of service.</p>	Julie Betteridge
----	--	---	---	------------------

5	<b>Sustainability</b> – Overall those aged 16-24 were more likely to state that the proposals would have high or some impact on them or their families – as Economic and Community Development feedback			
a)	Proposal to cease our sustainability function and stop delivering specialist sustainability activity, other than to reduce our own carbon footprint and provide the Affordable Warmth project.	<p>Analysis of the feedback shows that people age 16-24 are more likely to disagree with the proposals. This group also indicated it would feel the highest impact of the proposals.</p> <p>This specialist function coordinates the council’s sustainability and low carbon initiatives and delivers projects and schemes for residents while working in partnership with external agencies and organisations to deliver sustainability projects.</p> <p>Recent data up to June 2012, shows there have been 687 applicants to the Cumbria Warm Homes Scheme in Copeland. This supports vulnerable groups including over 70s and those on various means tested benefits including Disability Living Allowance and Child Tax Credit. We don’t run the scheme but work with the County Council and five other District Councils in partnership with Eon UK.</p> <p>It is considered there are no further disproportionate impacts anticipated on other protected characteristic groups.</p>	<p>We will find alternative ways to continue our own carbon management plan to reduce carbon use and costs in our buildings and working practices, especially where there is a financial saving that can be made.</p> <p>We will continue to support Affordable Warmth projects as a key priority area in the new look regeneration team.</p>	Julie Betteridge
6	<b>Discretionary Concessionary Travel</b> – Overall those aged 16-24 were more likely to state that the proposals would have high or some impact on them or their families – as Economic and Community Development feedback			
a)	Cease providing the	Analysis of the feedback indicates that people aged 65-74 were	Encourage take up of	Penny Mell

	<p>Discretionary Concessionary Travel Scheme (DCTS) of vouchers for transport in Copeland.</p>	<p>more likely to agree with the proposals (48% compared to 26% that disagree) while those aged 16-24 were most likely to disagree (63% compared to 13% that agreed). 48% of disabled people disagreed with the proposals compared to 25% that agreed.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Copeland Disability Forum also expressed concern about the impact of the proposals on the disabled people they represent. There were also general comments supporting the retention of the scheme within the consultation feedback.</p> <p>The DCTS is a discretionary scheme which the Council offers as an alternative to the English National Travel Concession Scheme (ENTCS) ran by Cumbria County Council. The scheme was reviewed and revised in detail in 2011/12 and offers vouchers to a value of £28 to eligible pensioners and eligible disabled residents in Copeland. At August 2012, 548 claimants were in receipt of the concession. 362 of those in receipt of the concession were claiming it under disability criteria of which 89 had a companion.</p> <p>The withdrawal of the scheme would have an impact on current service users.</p> <p>Overall 59% of claimants are female and 41% are male. 51% of those in the scheme follow Christianity and 6.4% another religion or belief. 45% are heterosexual, 0.7% LGBT. In terms of relationship status, 33% are married, 13% are widowed, 9% are single and 4% are single. The remaining % did not provide an answer to the question.</p> <p>Claimants are located across the Borough but are concentrated in the population centres of Whitehaven, Millom, Egremont and Cleator Moor.</p>	<p>the statutory English National Travel Concession Bus Pass which is administered by CCC and provides off peak travel for people of pensionable age and those with disabilities using the Now Card.</p> <p>Partnership working with Cumbria County Council to improve community transport initiatives across Copeland.</p> <p>Impact of welfare reform on disabled people in Copeland will be monitored.</p> <p>We will continue to implement and review the mitigating actions arising from the 2011/12 review of the scheme.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>It is considered that there could be a potential impact on the age and disability protected characteristics.</p> <p>It is considered there are no further disproportionate impacts anticipated on other protected characteristic groups.</p>		
<b>7</b>	<p><b>Parks and Open Spaces</b> – Overall 100% of people aged 16-24 and 79% of people aged 25-44 said that they would feel a high or some impact from the <b>grounds maintenance and street furniture and lights</b> proposals. Furthermore more females were more likely than males to say they would feel a high or some impact (69% compared to 33%). In relation to proposals for <b>public toilets</b> those aged 16-24 were more likely to say there would be high or some impact followed by those aged 65-74. 71% of disabled respondents said they would feel some or high impact compared to 60% non-disabled. There were no further significant differentials.</p>			
a)	<p>Grounds Maintenance</p> <p>Reduce the frequency at which we cut grass to once per year with pathways and perimeters cut more often in summer.</p> <p>Reduce the frequency of all other verges and greens to two cuts per year</p> <p>Remove three quarters of shrub beds and reseed them with grass</p>	<p>Analysis of the feedback shows that a higher number of people aged 16-24 disagree with the proposals (88% compared to 13% who agree). This age group indicated that it feel the most impact as a result of the proposals. While the feedback indicated a negligible difference between males and females in terms of agreement/disagreement with the proposals, 68% of females said they would be feel a higher impact compared to 33% of males.</p> <p>The proposals will lead to a reduced service in a number of areas including large open spaces, grass verging, shrub maintenance and flower beds, allotments, play areas and sports pitches. We know open spaces are used for social, leisure, health and play purposes.</p> <p>The Council maintains and inspects a number of play areas, some on behalf of other providers such as Home Group and Parish Councils. These are in locations across Whitehaven, Moresby, Pica, Parton, Lowca, Distington, Frizington, Cleator Moor and Cleator, Moor Row, Bigrigg, St Bees, Egremont, Seascale and Millom. There are also</p>	<p>It is important to note that the proposals are intended to ensure the continued usability of open spaces albeit at a reduced standards. We will ensure that pathways are accessible by cutting more frequently during the summer months.</p> <p>There will be continuity of play area provision. It is only fees and charges that are proposed to change at this time.</p>	Keith Parker

<p>Stop providing flower tubs, hanging baskets and floral displays across Copeland.</p> <p>Put in place a management fee for new play area developments to cover our management, maintenance and inspection costs</p> <p>Increase the hourly rate which we currently charge for managing, maintaining and inspecting play areas on behalf of partners and others</p> <p>Reduce allotment maintenance costs by carrying out essential maintenance only</p> <p>Reduce the standard of the council's sport provision by reducing maintenance to grass cuts and goal posts only.</p>	<p>skateparks at Egremont and Whitehaven and Multi Use Game Areas at Whitehaven and Cleator Moor.</p> <p>Playing fields and sports pitches could also be affected at locations across the Borough including Bransty, Hensingham, Mirehouse, Kells, Parton, Cleator Moor, Egremont and Millom. Several community football and rugby clubs formally use the sports pitches although it is understood they are used informally too.</p> <p>Allotments sites will also potentially be affected at Midgey, Sneckyeat, Crow Park and Cartgate in Whitehaven and Brisco Mount in Egremont. Of the data we do have across all sites on the plots in use, the composition of registered plot holders is 92% male and 8% female. A specified number of allotments have also been allocated to organisations including Age UK, the Howgill Family Centre and Starting Point. The council currently has 155 allotment plots in total across the sites and there is a waiting list of 123.</p> <p>An assessment on grounds maintenance proposals show that there could be a potential impact on the <b>age, gender</b> and possibly <b>disability</b> protected characteristics.</p> <p>It is considered that no disproportionate impacts are anticipated on other protected characteristic groups.</p>	<p>Where we can we will look for alternatives by working with community groups and organisations.</p> <p>We will look for Community Asset Transfer opportunities in accordance with our Community Asset Transfer Policy.</p>	
--	--	--	--



b)	<p>Street Furniture and Lights</p> <p>Seek alternative arrangements for the provision of Christmas lights in Whitehaven and Cleator Moor by 2015 and stop providing them if alternative arrangements cannot be found.</p> <p>Reduce the budget we allocate to street furniture and remove assets as they reach the end of their life rather than repair or replace them at our cost</p> <p>Stop funding CCTV in Whitehaven, Egremont, Cleator Moor, Frizington, Millom and St Bees in line with current police practice.</p>	<p>Analysis of the feedback shows that people aged 16-24 disagreed most with the proposals with 88% disagreeing. The feedback also showed a slightly higher % of disabled people disagreed with the proposals than non-disabled people (54% disabled compared to 40% non disabled).</p> <p>The feedback shows those aged 16-24 (100%) and 25-44 (79%) and females (69% compared to 33% males) felt they would be most impacted by the proposals.</p> <p>The Copeland Disability Forum has stated that it does not support street furniture on the whole as it does not work for people with various disabilities. CDF has been working with planning on reducing this over a number of years.</p> <p>It should also be noted that Outreach Cumbria and AWAZ referred to the potential benefit of CCTV and how it helps communities to feel safe.</p> <p>Street furniture refers to seating, bollards, gazebos, railing and gates and Christmas lights. The proposals may impact on all service users – residents, businesses and visitors.</p> <p>It is considered that no disproportionate impacts are anticipated on other protected characteristic groups.</p>	<p>We will seek to transfer Christmas lights in Whitehaven and Cleator Moor.</p> <p>We will ensure that street furniture is removed when it reaches the end of its life to ensure the safety of our public realm.</p>	Keith Parker
c)	Public Toilets	Analysis of the feedback shows proposed closures were opposed	We will seek	Keith Parker

	<p>Propose to close our public toilets in Whitehaven, Egremont, St Bees and Cleator Moor.</p> <p>Organisations that we grant aid to provide toilets may no longer receive this funding.</p>	<p>overall with negligible differentials in feedback received from each protected characteristic group. Those aged 16-24 and 65-74 were more likely to say there would be some or high impact.</p> <p>There were no significant differentials in those who agreed/disagreed with proposals on grant aid to provide toilet provision.</p> <p>The Copeland Disability Forum advised that those they represent have access to other disabled toilets and offered to share their list of accessible toilets.</p> <p>While the consultation did not lead to any further formal responses from representative groups opposing the proposal to close public toilets, previous experience of a past decision to close public toilets gifted to a private company elsewhere in the Borough did cause significant concern to one disability group. In this instance the group concluded that an accessible community toilet scheme was investigated. Therefore this should be noted.</p> <p>There is further insight on this matter from a 2008 DCLG Select Committee Review "Improving Access to Public Toilets". Equality issues in the main are referred to as: disability and the need for confidence, including accessibility for carers – also physical illness such as urinary and bowel disease. Gender in particular the women's biological needs of women and age, in particular for young children, the need for baby changing facilities and for older people who may need more regular and quicker access to toilets.</p> <p>The review was also covered Community Toilet Schemes and their suitability. In particular, pub provision is quite popular and it was</p>	<p>opportunities for other organisations to take on the management and maintenance such as Parish Councils. It is also important to note that there are number of alternative toilet facilities in Copeland such as council offices, supermarkets cafes and public houses which members of the public can use.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

		<p>questioned whether this was appropriate for women from ethnic minorities and young children.</p> <p>Potential disproportionate impacts on the age, gender and disability protected characteristics are anticipated.</p>		
<b>9</b>	<b>Waste and Recycling</b> – Overall those aged 16-24 were most likely to state that the proposals would have a high or some impact on them or their families.			
	<p>Charge for the collection of green waste (£35 per year)</p> <p>Reduced seasonal collection of green waste</p> <p>Charge for replacement of wheelie bins (£30 per year)</p> <p>Stop the kerbside collection of plastic and cardboard</p>	<p>Those aged 75+ are more likely to disagree (70%). It is considered that no disproportionate impact are anticipated on protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>Those aged 65-74 are most likely to agree (70%) and those aged 16-24 are most likely to disagree (63%). It is considered that no disproportionate impacts are anticipated on protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>Overall feedback shows neither group were more likely to agree or disagree with the proposal. It is considered that no disproportionate impacts are anticipated on protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>Those aged 16-24 were most likely to disagree (75%). Overall feedback shows neither group were more likely to agree or disagree with the proposal. It should be noted that Copeland Disability</p>	<p>We will provide assisted collections in line with the Council's policy on Assisted Collections.</p> <p>Home composting</p> <p>We will continue to provide 'bring sites'.</p>	Keith Parker

		<p>Forum considered that as the service is only provided in particular parts of the Borough and not others, it would be fairer to remove the service.</p> <p>It is considered that no disproportionate impacts are anticipated on protected characteristic groups.</p>		
<b>10</b>	<b>Civic and Corporate Savings – Overall no disproportionate impacts are anticipated</b>			
	<p>Reduce the Mayoral Budget</p> <p>Cease some subscriptions</p> <p>Stop producing Copeland Matters in printed format</p> <p>Copeland Centre Accommodation</p> <p>Review our Grant Provision</p>	<p>Analysis of the feedback shows there is overall agreement with the proposals</p> <p>It is considered there are no negative disproportionate impacts anticipated on the protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>It is considered there are no negative disproportionate impacts anticipated on the protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>It is considered there are no negative disproportionate impacts anticipated on the protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>It is considered there are no negative disproportionate impacts anticipated on the protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>This is subject to a separate report and EIA. However for the</p>	<p>Alternative formats would need to comply with our accessibility standards.</p>	<p>Corporate Leadership Team</p>

		purpose of this EIA and on the basis of feedback received on the policy proposals as set out, no disproportionate impact on protected characteristic groups is anticipated.		
<b>11</b>	<b>Fees and Charges</b> – Overall those aged 16-24 were most likely to say the proposals would have some or high impact.			
	<p>Taxi Licencing Proposal to increase taxi license fees to cover our costs and increase by inflation year on year</p> <p>Crematorium and Cemeteries Proposal to increase crematorium and cemetery fees so they cover total costs, which include major refurbishment, maintenance and new equipment.</p>	<p>Those people in the 25-44, 45-64 and 65-74 were most likely to agree. Those aged 16-24 were most like to say the proposal would have some or a high impact on them or their family. It is considered there are no negative disproportionate impacts anticipated on the protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>In terms of agreement/disagreement with the proposals the feedback showed no disproportionate impact on any protected characteristic group. Those aged 16-24 were most likely to say the proposal would have some or high impact on them or their family. It is considered there are no negative disproportionate impacts anticipated on the protected characteristic groups.</p>		<p>Darienne Law</p> <p>Keith Parker</p>

	<p>Car Parking</p> <p>Proposal to increase our car parking charges by the equivalent of an additional 22p on a 1 hour tariff and 70p on a 4 hour tariff to ensure Pay and Display Car Parks are covering their own costs.</p>	<p>All service users will be impacted upon but disabled service users will see no change.</p> <p>In terms of agreement/disagreement with the proposals the feedback showed no disproportionate impact on any protected characteristic group.</p> <p>100% of those aged 16-24 responding that the proposal would impact on them or their family.</p> <p>It is considered there are no negative disproportionate impacts anticipated on the protected characteristic groups.</p>	<p>The Blue Badge will still be available for disabled service users. However in this instance there is not thought to be any disproportionate direct impact on disabled users.</p> <p>We will seek opportunities to offer Community Asset Transfer where full cost recovery cannot be applied in line with our own Community Asset Transfer Policy.</p>	Keith Parker
--	---	--	--	--------------