



To: Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources:  
George Owers

Report by: Director of Business Transformation

Relevant scrutiny committee: Strategy & Resources 14 July 2014

Wards affected: All Wards

**Budget 2014/15 – Amendment proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group  
(Updated for the Executive Amendment to Council )**

**Key Decision**

**1. Executive summary**

- 1.1 This report sets out a budget amendment proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group.
- 1.2 The appendices to this report present the budget proposals in relation to specific budget items for both General Fund (GF) Revenue and Capital as follows:
- (i) to add new budget proposals
  - (ii) to amend or delete specific revenue budgets
  - (iii) to amend changes to the Capital & Revenue projects Plan
  - (iv) to amend contributions to and use of Earmarked Funds.
- 1.3 The item descriptions included in Appendix A have been provided by the Liberal Democrat Group.
- 1.4 The purpose of this amendment, as stated by the Liberal Democrat Group, is:
- (i) to maintain the council's commitment to the easing of congestion in the city, in particular by sustaining the "Keep Cambridge Moving Fund" to strengthen the council's leverage with the county council and the highways agency for traffic mitigation measures arising from the growth associated with the enlargement of the A14;
  - (ii) prior to committing resources to the Anti-Poverty Strategy, to await the clear definition of areas where the city council expenditure is realistically able to provide measurable long term reduction in poverty in the city;
  - (iii) to continue to meet needs for future policy initiatives, whether fixed term or ongoing, through the existing budgeted Priority Policy Fund;
  - (iv) to enable momentum to be maintained in the council's established councillor-led Living Wage policy in conjunction with the council's

accreditation with the living wage foundation and the promotion of the living wage week;

- (v) to increase the council's general custodianship of public open spaces by providing additional on-the-spot staff for peak times of the year, including but not unduly focused on enforcement activity.

## 2. Recommendations

2.1 To recommend to Council budget changes as outlined in the following:

### **General Fund Revenue Budgets:**

2.2 Approve the following revenue budget changes:

- delete or add new items funded from General Fund Reserves, as shown in Appendix A, with item descriptions provided by the Liberal Democrat Group
- delete items funded from External or Earmarked Funds, as shown in Appendix B

### **Capital & Revenue Projects Plan:**

2.3 Approve the capital amendment, as shown in Appendix C.

### **Earmarked Reserves:**

2.4 Approve changes as follows:

- ***Amend the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund'.***

The Budget-Setting Report approved by Council in February 2014 included a contribution to this fund of £1,063.9k and the Executive have reduced this to £263.9k. This amendment proposes to reverse this. The updated Earmarked and Specific Funds are shown in Appendix D.

- ***Delete the earmarked reserve of £500,000 for 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'***
- ***Delete the earmarked reserve of £300,000 for 'Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund'.***

## 3. Earmarked Reserves

3.1 It is recommended that the revenue and capital contributions to "Keep Cambridge Moving Fund" are re-instated so that the fund balance will be £1.5m, deleting the proposed new earmarked funds.

## 4. Capital

- 4.1 The Liberal Democrat Group are proposing to reverse the Executive proposal by reinstating the 'Capital contribution to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' of £111,140, as identified in Appendix C.

## 5. Implications

### (a) Financial Implications

The financial implications are outlined in the proposals. The follow table summarises the revenue position:

|     | <b>Delete (£)</b>   | <b>2014/15</b>  | <b>2015/16 onwards</b> |
|-----|---|-----------------|------------------------|
| LB2 | Bolstering Public Realm enforcement                                   | (51,000)        | (102,000)              |
| LS6 | Increase charges at Public toilets                                    | 5,000           | 10,000                 |
| LS6 | Executive Amendment to Council:<br>item now withdrawn                 | (5,000)         | (10,000)               |
| LS5 | Return planning from Area committees to<br>central planning Committee | 3,400           | 3,400                  |
| LS1 | Increase Roundabout charges   | 0               | 5,000                  |
| -   | Surplus to 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'                                  | (9,760)         | 0                      |
|     |   | <b>(57,360)</b> | <b>(93,600)</b>        |

|     | <b>New (£)</b>                         |                 |                 |
|-----|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| LD1 | Support Living Wage week               | 2,000           | 2,000           |
| LD2 | 4 Seasonal part-time Park Rangers      | 14,720          | 58,870          |
|     |  | <b>16,720</b>   | <b>60,870</b>   |
|     | <b>Return to General Fund Reserves</b> | <b>(40,640)</b> | <b>(32,730)</b> |

### (b) Staffing Implications

Where relevant, these are included in the proposals outlined in the Appendices.

### (c) Equal Opportunities Implications

An Equality Impact Assessment is included as Appendix E.

### (d) Consultation

Public consultations relating to Council services are undertaken throughout the year, and details can be found on the Council's website - details of the results of the 2013 survey can be found on the internet at: <http://alturl.com/h9jgw>

### (e) Community Safety

Where relevant, these are included in the proposals outlined in the Appendices.

(g) **Environmental Implications**

Where relevant, officers have considered the environmental impact of budget proposals.

**6. Background papers**

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Mid-Year Financial Review (MFR) 2013
- Budget files: Revised 2013/14 and Original 2014/15.

**7. Appendices**

In this Report:

**Budget 2014/15 – Liberal Democrat Group Amendment:**

- Appendix A - Revenue items \*
- Appendix B - Earmarked items
- Appendix C - Capital items
- Appendix D - Earmarked & Specific Funds
- Appendix E - Equality Impact Assessment \*

\* = (updated for the Executive Amendment to Council).

**8. Inspection of papers**

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: John Harvey  
Author's Phone Number: 01223 - 458143  
Author's Email: john.harvey@cambridge.gov.uk

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Revenue (General Fund Reserves) - Appendix A

| Reference     | Portfolio                            | Old Portfolio                                | Item Description  | 2014/15<br>Budget<br>£ | 2015/16<br>Budget<br>£ | 2016/17<br>Budget<br>£ | 2017/18<br>Budget<br>£ | Contact         |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Delete</b> |                                      |  |   |                        |                        |                        |                        |                 |
| LNCL1         | Finance and Resources                | Strategy & Resources - Strategy              | <b>Decrease contribution to Keep Cambridge Moving Fund</b><br><br>Traffic congestion is one of the factors endangering the continuing prosperity of Cambridge: down-grading the fund to deal with this is unacceptable when the opportunity to implement long held ambitions may arise at short notice or match funding could be demanded by the County to implement schemes. We have a one-off opportunity to get a key part of the city's future success right: we need to be prepared. | 688,860                | 0                      | 0                      | 0                      | Simon Payne     |
| LNCL2         | Finance and Resources                | Strategy & Resources - Strategy              | <b>Contribution to create 'Sharing Prosperity Fund</b><br><br>While fully supporting the expressed concern about the pockets of poverty in the city, in view of the extensive work already done by the council to alleviate it, we need a coherent strategy to bring things together and identify gaps where council action would be appropriate and effective. Until that is done, this fund is premature.   | (500,000)              | 0                      | 0                      | 0                      | Andrew Limb     |
| LNCL3         | Finance and Resources                | Strategy & Resources - Strategy              | <b>Contribution to create a Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund (FTPPF)</b><br><br>There is no need for a separate fund as the previous administration was very careful to allocate money from the NHB to things which would increase the NHB or were of a time-limited nature. Separate funds limit the ability of the Council to be flexible to achieve its aims.  | (300,000)              | 0                      | 0                      | 0                      | Ray Ward        |
| LS6           | Environment, Waste and Public Health | Environment - Environmental & Waste Services | <b>Increase charges at public toilets that require pavement</b><br><br>This breaks the policy that charges would be minimal so all could afford to use them but would provide a bar to casual vandalism. Changing the locks will cost money and needing two coins will be inconvenient for the public.<br><br><b>Executive Amendment to Council: item now withdrawn</b><br><br><b>The Liberal Democrat Group welcomes the Executive's 11th hour reversal of this proposal.</b>            | 5,000                  | 10,000                 | 10,000                 | 10,000                 | Bob Carter      |
| LS1           | City Centre and Public Places        | Environment - Public Places                  | <b>Increase roundabout sponsorship</b><br><br>Premature to count on this increased sum as every proposal will need planning permission which residents in conservation areas have opposed vigorously in the past.   | 0                      | 5,000                  | 5,000                  | 5,000                  | Alistair Wilson |

| Reference                             | Portfolio                            | Old Portfolio  | Item Description  | 2014/15<br>Budget<br>£ | 2015/16<br>Budget<br>£ | 2016/17<br>Budget<br>£ | 2017/18<br>Budget<br>£ | Contact         |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| LS5                                   | Finance and Resources                | Strategy & Resources - Customer Services & Resources | <b>Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee</b><br><br>The Liberal Democrat group are committed to devolving decision making to local communities across the city. The determination of planning at area committees is a clear demonstration of this commitment. The removal of planning from area committees and the reduction in their frequency is a clear erosion of local decision making and is something we oppose. | 3,400                  | 3,400                  | 3,400                  | 3,400                  | Gary Cliff      |
| LB2                                   | Environment, Waste and Public Health | Environment - Environmental & Waste Services         | <b>Bolstering Public Realm Enforcement</b><br><br>There is a fundamental difference of approach between the two groups on where the line should be drawn between engagement/education and enforcement. We oppose the more punitive attitude taken by the leading group as we do not think criminalising people quickly is appropriate or in the long-term good of the city.   | (51,000)               | (102,000)              | (102,000)              | (102,000)              | Adrian Ash      |
| LB3                                   | Finance and Resources                | Strategy & Resources - Strategy                      | <b>Contributions from core funding to 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'</b><br><br>See LNCL2  | (14,760)               | 0                      | 0                      | 0                      | Ray Ward        |
| <b>Executive Amendment to Council</b> |                                      |  |   | <b>5,000</b>           | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>               | <b>Ray Ward</b> |

## Add new

|     |                                      |  |   |        |        |        |        |                 |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|
| LD1 | Strategy and Transformation          | Strategy & Resources - Strategy              | <b>Provision of budget to support Living Wage week</b><br><br>The city council is committed to the adoption of the living wage within Cambridge. It was introduced by the council in 2013 and it has initiated accreditation of the authority by the living wage foundation. The Liberal Democrat group believe that engagement with other employers should be undertaken at a senior political level and in conjunction with the living wage foundation. The proposed funding will provide a platform during the living wage week for the council to undertake this. | 2,000  | 2,000  | 2,000  | 2,000  | Deborah Simpson |
| LD2 | Environment, Waste and Public Health | Environment - Environmental & Waste Services | <b>Creation of 4 seasonal part-time Park Rangers</b><br><br>New posts to provide broad council guardianship of the most frequented public open spaces at busiest times of the year, stretching from on the spot first aid litter management and maintenance reporting to the issue of fixed penalty notices when appropriate in accordance with the council's policy. Post holders to work a 3 day week, including weekends and public holidays, with post holders assigned to particular open spaces and contactable by users.                                       | 14,720 | 58,870 | 58,870 | 58,870 | Adrian Ash      |

|                          |  |  |  |                  |                 |                 |                 |  |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| <b>Net Revenue items</b> |  |  |  | <b>(151,780)</b> | <b>(32,730)</b> | <b>(32,730)</b> | <b>(32,730)</b> |  |
|                          |  |  | <b>Return to General Fund Reserves</b>           | 40,640           | 22,730          | 22,730          | 22,730          |  |
|                          |  |  | <b>Executive Amendment to Council</b>            | <b>0</b>         | <b>10,000</b>   | <b>10,000</b>   | <b>10,000</b>   |  |
|                          |  |  | <b>Return to General Fund Reserves (updated)</b> | <b>40,640</b>    | <b>32,730</b>   | <b>32,730</b>   | <b>32,730</b>   |  |
| <b>Net Revenue</b>       |  |  |  | <b>(111,140)</b> | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>        |  |

## **Cambridge City Council Equality Impact Assessment**



Completing an Equality Impact Assessment will help you to think about what impact your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service may have on people that live in, work in or visit Cambridge, as well as on City Council staff.

The template is easy to use. You do not need to have specialist equalities knowledge to complete it. It asks you to make judgements based on evidence and experience. There are guidance notes on the intranet to help you. You can also get advice from Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer on 01223 457174 or email [suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk) or from any member of the Joint Equalities Group.

**1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service:**

Budget 2014/15 – Amendment proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

### 2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

The objective of the Liberal Democrat Group amendment is to propose changes to the budget for the General Fund for 2014/15, following the Executive Amendment. The proposed Liberal Democrat Group amendments include: new budget proposals; amendments to, or deletion of, specific existing revenue budgets; amendments to existing items on the Capital and Revenue Projects Plan.

This EQIA provides an assessment of the equality impacts of the amendments proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group, based on the information available about each project – the information is taken directly from the Liberal Democrat Group proposal and referenced below

There is a more detailed EqIA on item LS5 (returning planning from area committees to a central planning committee) which is the subject of a separate report and EqIA to Environment Scrutiny Committee on 8 July.

It is recommended that should any of the Liberal Democrat Group amendments be agreed, a fuller and more comprehensive EqIA should be completed.

The Liberal Democrat Group amendments are listed here and are evaluated later on in the assessment.

#### **LNCL1 Decrease contribution to Keep Cambridge Moving Fund**

“Traffic congestion is one of the factors endangering the continuing prosperity of Cambridge: down-grading the fund to deal with this is unacceptable when the opportunity to implement long held ambitions may arise at short notice or match funding could be demanded by the County to implement schemes. We have a one-off opportunity to get a key part of the city's future success right: we need to be prepared.”

#### **LNCL2 Contribution to create 'Sharing Prosperity Fund/ LB3 Contributions from core funding to 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'**

“While fully supporting the expressed concern about the pockets of poverty in the city, in view of the extensive work already done by the council to alleviate it, we need a coherent strategy to bring things together and identify gaps where council action would be appropriate and effective. Until that is done, this fund is premature”

#### **LNCL3 Contribution to create a Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund (FTPPF)**

“There is no need for a separate fund as the previous administration was very careful to allocate money from the NHB to things which would increase the NHB or were of a time-limited nature. Separate funds limit the ability of the Council to be flexible to achieve its aims”

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

### 2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

#### **LS6 Increase charges at public toilets that require payment**

“This breaks the policy that charges would be minimal so all could afford to use them but would provide a bar to casual vandalism. Changing the locks will cost money and needing two coins will be inconvenient for the public”

*23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014 - Please note the following information - On the 14<sup>th</sup> of July 2014, at the Strategy and Resources Committee, the original budget amendment and its corresponding EqIA was recommended to go through to full Council for approval.*

*Since then, there has been more information on the costs of LS6 (the Executives proposal to increase the charges for some toilets) and the overall estimation of the cost may now be higher. In light of this, there is a proposal to remove LS6 from the original budget amendment. This is conditional to the recommendation being approved at full Council on the 24<sup>th</sup> of July 2014.*

*If the recommendation for removal is approved, this EqIA should be read without reference to LS6 which will only be retained in this document for future reference.*

#### **LS1 Increase roundabout sponsorship**

“Premature to count on this increased sum as every proposal will need planning permission which residents in conservation areas have opposed vigorously in the past”

#### **LS5 Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee**

“The Liberal Democrat group are committed to devolving decision making to local communities across the city. The determination of planning at area committees is a clear demonstration of this commitment. The removal of planning from area committees and the reduction in their frequency is a clear erosion of local decision making and is something we oppose”

#### **LB2 Bolstering Public Realm Enforcement**

“There is a fundamental difference of approach between the two groups on where the line should be drawn between engagement/education and enforcement. We oppose the more punitive attitude taken by the leading group as we do not think criminalising people quickly is appropriate or in the long-term good of the city”

#### **\*New Proposal\* LD1 Provision of budget to support Living Wage week**

“The City Council is committed to the adoption of the living wage within Cambridge. It was introduced by the council in 2013 and it has initiated accreditation of the authority by the living wage foundation. The Liberal Democrat group believe that engagement with other employers should be undertaken at a senior political level and in conjunction with the living wage foundation. The proposed funding will provide a platform during the living wage week for the council to undertake this”

#### **\*New Proposal\* LD2 Creation of 4 seasonal part-time Park Rangers**

“New posts to provide broad council guardianship of the most frequented public open spaces at busiest times of the year, stretching from on the spot first aid litter management and

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

### 2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

maintenance reporting to the issue of fixed penalty notices when appropriate in accordance with the council's policy. Post holders to work a 3 day week, including weekends and public holidays, with post holders assigned to particular open spaces and contactable by users”

### 3. Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service? (Please tick those that apply)

- Residents
- Visitors
- Staff

A specific client group or groups (please state):

This is an assessment of proposed amendments to the Council's budget. The amendments relate to a number of different City Council service areas. Some of the proposals will have a universal impact, while others may have a differential impact on particular client groups. Further information on these impacts is set out in section 7 of this assessment.

### 4. What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this? (Please tick)

- New
- Revised
- Existing

### 5. Responsible directorate and service

Directorate: Business Transformation

Service: Accounting Services

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

### 6. Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

No

Yes (please give details):

The proposed amendments would require action by a number of City Council services, including City Homes, Corporate Strategy, Human Resources, Planning, Property Services, Refuse and Environment, Streets and Open Spaces, and Tourism and City Centre Management

### 7. Potential impact

Please list and explain how this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could **positively** or **negatively** affect individuals from the following equalities groups.

When answering this question, please think about:

- The results of relevant consultation that you or others have completed (for example with residents, people that work in or visit Cambridge, service users, staff or partner organisations).
- Complaints information.
- Performance information.
- Information about people using your service (for example whether people from certain equalities groups use the service more or less than others).
- Inspection results.
- Comparisons with other organisations.
- The implementation of your piece of work (don't just assess what you think the impact will be after you have completed your work, but also think about what steps you might have to take to make sure that the implementation of your work does not negatively impact on people from a particular equality group).
- The relevant premises involved.
- Your communications.
- National research (local information is not always available, particularly for some equalities groups, so use national research to provide evidence for your conclusions).

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

**(a) Age** (any group of people of a particular age, including younger and older people – in particular, please consider any safeguarding issues for children and vulnerable adults)

**LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment** - The Executive amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, which could include some older people. The Liberal Democrat Group amendment suggests that keeping some cost at a lower rate which may benefit those older people who frequently use the facilities.

*23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014 - Please note the following information - On the 14<sup>th</sup> of July 2014, at the Strategy and Resources Committee, the original budget amendment and its corresponding EqlA was recommended to go through to full Council for approval.*

*Since then, there has been more information on the costs of LS6 (the Executives proposal to increase the charges for some toilets) and the overall estimation of the cost may now be higher. In light of this, there is a proposal to remove LS6 from the original budget amendment. This is conditional to the recommendation being approved at full Council on the 24<sup>th</sup> of July 2014.*

*If the recommendation for removal is approved, this EqlA should be read without reference to LS6 which will only be retained in this document for future reference.*

**LS5 - Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee** – The Liberal Democrat Group proposal suggests keeping planning decisions at area committee meetings held in community venues rather than moving to a central planning committee held in the Guildhall. This could have both positive and negative impacts for different age groups.

There could be benefits for some people who have mobility issues, including some older people who might find it more difficult to travel in from the area in which they live into the centre of the City to attend meetings.

However the Guildhall is located in the centre of Cambridge, arguably the most accessible part of Cambridge by public transport. The Guildhall is also an accessible public building, set up and fully equipped for meetings to take place.

Keeping evening meetings instead of afternoon meetings could have both positive and negative impacts for different age groups. Meetings that take place in the evenings are better for working people, people of school age or anyone normally unavailable during the day would need to arrange time off to attend an afternoon meeting.

However, for afternoon meetings might be better for people who may not wish to be out in the evenings or late at night or who are not normally available in the evening. The availability of public transport is also better during the daytime compared to late evening.

**LX2 - Living Wage External Campaign Officer and LX3 - Promotion Budget to accompany Living Wage Campaign** – The Liberal Democrat Group amendment would remove the proposal for a dedicated officer to promote the Living Wage. If engagement is undertaken at a senior political level, to promote the uptake of organisations paying a Living Wage to their staff, this may have a positive impact on those residents who are currently not

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

paid the Living Wage.

There may be a disproportionate representation of some of the protected characteristics amongst those who are currently paid less than the Living Wage in the City. For example, recent national research by the Resolution Foundation (Low Pay Britain, 2012) found that people aged 16-20 (76%), 21-30 (27%) and 60+ (23%) are most likely to receive less than the living wage. However, further research would be needed to demonstrate the impact on particular groups within Cambridge, as trends may differ from those observed nationally.

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

**(b) Disability** (including people with a physical impairment, sensory impairment, learning disability, mental health problem or other condition which has an impact on their daily life)

### **LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment**

The Executive amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, which could include some people with disabilities. The Liberal Democrat Group amendment suggests that keeping some cost at a lower rate which may benefit those people with disabilities or health conditions who frequently use the facilities.

*23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014 - Please note the following information - On the 14<sup>th</sup> of July 2014, at the Strategy and Resources Committee, the original budget amendment and its corresponding EqlA was recommended to go through to full Council for approval.*

*Since then, there has been more information on the costs of LS6 (the Executives proposal to increase the charges for some toilets) and the overall estimation of the cost may now be higher. In light of this, there is a proposal to remove LS6 from the original budget amendment. This is conditional to the recommendation being approved at full Council on the 24<sup>th</sup> of July 2014.*

*If the recommendation for removal is approved, this EqlA should be read without reference to LS6 which will only be retained in this document for future reference.*

### **LS5 - Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee**

The Liberal Democrat Group proposal suggests keeping planning decisions at area committee meetings held in community venues rather than moving to a central planning committee held in the Guildhall. This could have both positive and negative impacts for different groups of people who may have disabilities or health needs.

There could be benefits for some people who have mobility issues who might find it more difficult to travel in from the area in which they live to the centre of the City to attend meetings.

However the Guildhall is located in the centre of Cambridge, arguably the most accessible part of Cambridge by public transport. The Guildhall is also an accessible public building, set up and fully equipped for meetings to take place.

However, for afternoon meetings might be better for people who may not wish to be out in the evenings or late at night or who may rely on additional support to attend meetings.

The availability of public transport is also better during the daytime compared to late evening.

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

### (c) Gender

**LX2 - Living Wage External Campaign Officer and LX3 - Promotion Budget to accompany Living Wage Campaign** - The Liberal Democrat Group amendment would remove the proposal for a dedicated officer to promote the Living Wage. If engagement is undertaken at a senior political level, to promote the uptake of organisations paying a Living Wage to their staff, this may have a positive impact on those residents who are currently not paid the Living Wage. The promotion of the living wage within the City may result in more businesses and other organisations within the City, including the Universities, paying a Living Wage to their staff, could have a positive impact on those residents who are currently not paid the Living Wage.

There may be a disproportionate representation of some of the protected characteristics amongst those who are currently paid less than the Living Wage in the City. For example, recent national research by the Resolution Foundation (Low Pay Britain, 2012) found that a higher proportion of women (25%) receive less than the living wage than men (15%). However, further research would be needed to demonstrate the impact on particular groups within Cambridge, as trends may differ from those observed nationally.

**LS5 - Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee** - There are no specific gender implications from this proposed change. However, attending meetings in the afternoon may be more difficult if individuals have primary childcare or caring responsibilities, but this may apply equally to the evening.

### (d) Pregnancy and maternity

**LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment** - The Executive amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, including those who are pregnant or those with young children. The Liberal Democrat Group amendment suggests that keeping some cost at a lower rate which may benefit those people/ families who frequently use the facilities.

*23<sup>d</sup> July 2014 - Please note the following information - On the 14<sup>th</sup> of July 2014, at the Strategy and Resources Committee, the original budget amendment and its corresponding EqIA was recommended to go through to full Council for approval.*

*Since then, there has been more information on the costs of LS6 (the Executives proposal to increase the charges for some toilets) and the overall estimation of the cost may now be higher. In light of this, there is a proposal to remove LS6 from the original budget amendment. This is conditional to the recommendation being approved at full Council on the 24<sup>th</sup> of July 2014.*

*If the recommendation for removal is approved, this EqIA should be read without reference to LS6 which will only be retained in this document for future reference.*

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

### (e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)

**LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment** - The Executive amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a disproportionate impact on transgender people. The City Council provides toilets in 21 locations, of which 14 are free and 7 are subject to a 20p charge for use. Of the 7 which are subject to charges, 6 are unisex toilets, while a mixture of male, female and unisex toilets are provided at the seventh location (Drummer Street). Transgender residents and visitors may feel more comfortable using unisex toilets rather than designated male or female toilets in the city.

*23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014 - Please note the following information - On the 14<sup>th</sup> of July 2014, at the Strategy and Resources Committee, the original budget amendment and its corresponding EqlA was recommended to go through to full Council for approval.*

*Since then, there has been more information on the costs of LS6 (the Executives proposal to increase the charges for some toilets) and the overall estimation of the cost may now be higher. In light of this, there is a proposal to remove LS6 from the original budget amendment. This is conditional to the recommendation being approved at full Council on the 24<sup>th</sup> of July 2014.*

*If the recommendation for removal is approved, this EqlA should be read without reference to LS6 which will only be retained in this document for future reference.*

### (f) Marriage and Civil Partnership

No differential impact on people of particular marital or civil partnership status has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments.

### (g) Race or Ethnicity

No differential impact on people of a particular race or ethnicity has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments.

### (h) Religion or Belief

No differential impact on people of particular religion or beliefs has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments

### (i) Sexual Orientation

No differential impact on people of a particular sexual orientation has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

**(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – in particular – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty (please state):**

**LNCL1 - Maintaining the contribution to the Keep Cambridge Moving Fund and LNCL2 - Contribution to Sharing Prosperity Fund.** - These amendments propose to reinstate the capital contribution to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' and Capital Plan SC593 [Linked to LNCL1] and would mean not investing £500,000 in the Executive's proposed 'Sharing Prosperity Fund' to support the delivery of an Anti-Poverty Strategy.

This may mean that the reversal of the funding proposal could have a negative impact on residents on low incomes, by removing an earmarked fund which would support projects that aim to assist those on low incomes, reduce economic inequality and ameliorate deprivation.

The initial projects that would have been supported by the Fund were likely to have had a positive impact on those on low incomes, including the expanded programme of 'Community Clear-Out Days', the Living Wage Campaign Officer, the Water Costs Anti-Poverty Scheme, the extra project budget for private sector energy and the Youth Apprenticeship Programme – referenced below. The remainder of the Fund would have been used to support projects which meet the objectives of the Anti-Poverty Strategy.

- LX1 - Expanded programme of 'Community Clear Out Days'
- LX2 - Living Wage External Campaign Officer and LX3 - Promotion Budget to accompany Living Wage Campaign -
- LX4 - Water and Energy Costs Anti-Poverty Scheme
- LX5 - Extra project budget for Private Sector Energy Officer
- LX6 - Youth Apprenticeship Programme

By proposing to retain the "Keep Cambridge Moving Fund" and tackle things like traffic congestion instead, the amendment may have a positive impact on transport and mobility across the City which may have indirect impacts on employees and employers. There may also be some health impacts in terms of air quality and road safety. This would need to be explored in more detail in a revised EqlA as there is limited information available currently.

**8. If you have any additional comments please add them here**

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

### 9. Conclusions and Next Steps

- If you have not identified any negative impacts, please sign off this form.
- If you have identified potential negative actions, you must complete the action plan at the end of this document to set out how you propose to mitigate the impact. If you do not feel that the potential negative impact can be mitigated, you must complete question 8 to explain why that is the case.
- If there is insufficient evidence to say whether or not there is likely to be a negative impact, please complete the action plan setting out what additional information you need to gather to complete the assessment.

All completed Equality Impact Assessments must be emailed to Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer, who will arrange for it to be published on the City Council's website.  
Email [suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk)

### 10. Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer: David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted:

Date of completion: 24 June 2014

Date amended – 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014 – see LS6 for more detail.

Date of next review of the assessment:

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

### Action Plan

Equality Impact Assessment title:

Date of completion:

| Equality Group  | Age |
|---|-----|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |     |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |     |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |     |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |     |

| Equality Group  | Disability |
|---|------------|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |            |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |            |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |            |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |            |

| Equality Group  | Gender |
|---|--------|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |        |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |        |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |        |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |        |

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

| Equality Group  | Pregnancy and Maternity |
|---|-------------------------|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |                         |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |                         |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |                         |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |                         |

| Equality Group  | Transgender |
|---|-------------|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |             |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |             |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |             |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |             |

| Equality Group  | Marriage and Civil Partnership |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |                                |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |                                |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |                                |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |                                |

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

| Equality Group  | Race or Ethnicity |
|---|-------------------|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |                   |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |                   |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |                   |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |                   |

| Equality Group  | Religion or Belief |
|---|--------------------|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |                    |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |                    |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |                    |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |                    |

| Equality Group  | Sexual Orientation |
|---|--------------------|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |                    |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |                    |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |                    |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |                    |

## Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

| Other factors that may lead to inequality                         |  |
|---|--|
| Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact               |  |
| Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact |  |
| Officer responsible for progressing the action                    |  |
| Date action to be completed by                                    |  |