

## **CABINET**

**14 FEBRUARY 2012**

### **SOUTH THAMES GATEWAY BUILDING CONTROL PARTNERSHIP – BUSINESS PLAN AND PARTNERSHIP SECOND TERM**

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Jane Chitty, Strategic Development and Economic Growth and Member of Joint Committee

Report from: Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture

Author: Tony Van Veghel, Director, South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership  
Stephen Gaimster, Assistant Director, Development, Economy and Transport

#### **Summary**

This report seeks agreement to the seventh draft of the South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership Business Plan for 2011/2014 (Incorporating financial Plan 2011-15), and for agreement for Medway to continue in the Partnership for a second term.

#### **1. Budget and Policy Framework**

- 1.1 The approval of the South Thames Gateway (STG) Building Control Partnership Business Plan is a matter for Cabinet, however, specific parts of the plan may need to be progressed in accordance with the Council's relevant policies and procedures.
- 1.2 The STG Building Control Partnership came into existence on 1 October 2007 bringing together the building control services of Gravesham, Medway and Swale councils. The Memorandum of Agreement which underpins the Partnership and which was signed by all three partners, calls for the first term of the Partnership to last for 5 years after which time each authority would either agree to a second term or exit from the agreement by an agreed route.

## **2. Background**

- 2.1 The South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership (involving Medway, Gravesham and Swale) went live in 2007 and the Partnership's business plan outlines how the building control function for the three Partnership Councils will be delivered over the next three financial years.
- 2.2 The Joint Committee's Constitution sets out the process for approval of the business plan each year and the timing required to ensure that each partner authority is able to incorporate associated budget requirements into the financial planning process for the subsequent year. The stages to this process are as follows:
- Before 1 October each year the Joint Committee is required to approve and send its draft Business Plan for the following year to each partner authority for comments.
  - Each Council has 35 days (from receipt) to provide comments to the secretary of the Joint Committee on the draft business plan. In order to streamline the process the Cabinets in each partner authority have agreed to delegate authority to the relevant director, in consultation with the council's Chief Finance Officer and appointed member on the Joint Committee to deal with this element of the process.
  - The Joint Committee is then required to meet to consider any comments received and agree any revisions to the draft business plan.
  - By no later than 5 January the Joint Committee has to send a revised draft to each partner authority for their final approval.
  - Each partner authority must advise the Secretary to the Joint Committee whether it approves or rejects the revised draft business plan by no later than 10 days before the Annual Meeting of the Joint Committee. (The Joint Committee will formally adopt the Business Plan at its Annual meeting).
- 2.3 There are also provisions in the Constitution of the Joint Committee stipulating the process and timescales for agreeing amendments to the business plan during the course of each year.
- 2.4 On 8 December 2011 the Joint Committee agreed the draft South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership's Business Plan for 2011/14 as set out in an exempt appendix. This encompasses the comments already received from the Partner Authorities. However, the three year business plan extends beyond the first term of the Partnership agreement. Therefore, at Joint Committee Members also considered a report regarding the Partnership continuing for a second term and unanimously supported the proposal.

- 2.5 The aim of the Partnership was to build in resilience to the service which was exposed to high levels of competition from the private sector for both work and resources. It was also formed to develop a larger critical mass which would be able to benefit from economies of scale, improve the service to customers and to develop the potential to deliver alternative income streams.
- 2.6 The Partnership was also seen as a vehicle for improving opportunities for staff development and training which was not always possible in the smaller building control units. It was also envisaged that the Partnership would be able to deliver cost reductions to each authority by reducing overheads and negotiating service level agreements with service providers.
- 2.7 Gravesham Borough Council's Cabinet agreed to continue in the partnership for a second term and agreed the Business Plan at its meeting on 9 January 2012. Swale Borough Council is considering a report on this matter on 8 February 2012.

### **3. Options**

- 3.1 The Cabinet needs to advise the Secretary to the Joint Committee whether it approves or rejects the revised draft business plan.
- 3.2 Each authority has the option of agreeing a further term for the Partnership for a period of 5 years (or alternative time period as agreed) or to withdraw from the Partnership and return the service in-house following the exit arrangements detailed in the Memorandum of Agreement.
- 3.3 The Building Control function is a statutory duty under the Building Act 1984 and therefore whether through the Partnership or through individual in-house "services" each of the partner authorities would have to provide this function.
- 3.4 Option 1: To remain within the Partnership for a second term, build on the success outlined in this report and benefit from the economies of scale, direct cost savings, additional services and planned expenditure contained in the financial section of the Business Plan to 2011/14.
- 3.5 Option 2: To withdraw from the Partnership and bring the service back in-house. This would allow the Local Authority to look at the possibility of outsourcing the service. Given the limited information available to date, it is difficult to establish whether there are any benefits for outsourcing the service at this stage. Overall, there would be a number of significant cost and organisational considerations to take into account if this option were taken.
- 3.6 If one authority left the Partnership, dependent on which one, support services would have to be realigned and if it were the host authority

accommodation as well. For those remaining in the Partnership current accommodation would be excessive and an alternative would have to be found. Should Medway withdraw, Gravesham and Swale would be unconnected with problems of cross-boundary servicing. Whilst an in-house service may provide local control with some easier links with other on-site services, these have not been an issue over the last 5 years. There would, however, be significant setup and running costs together with a number of other issues which may need to be taken into account as shown in Appendix 1.

#### 4. Advice and analysis

4.1 The progress of the Partnership has been closely monitored by the Joint Committee which meets at least four times a year and by a Steering Group of senior offices representing each authority. At the Joint Committee in December, Members were unanimous in their support of a further term for the Partnership which was remarked on as being a very successful project which has delivered its objectives through extremely difficult economic times.

#### Financial

4.2 The formation of the Partnership saw the constituent authorities pooling their 'direct', building control budgets (staffing, running costs etc) to fund the new organisation. It also gave the partners the opportunity to rationalise indirect support costs.

4.3 In terms of direct costs, Table 1 below provides an overview of the changes that have occurred in the five years of operation.

**Table 1**

	Combined budgets 2006/7	2006/7 budgets adjusted to 2011/12 price levels	STG Forecast 2011/12	STG Business Plan 2012/13	STG Business Plan 2013/14
	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Staff costs	1,243	1,325	1,077	1,093	1108
Other direct costs	281	285	261	256	256
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,524</b>	<b>1,610</b>	<b>1,338</b>	<b>1349</b>	<b>1364</b>
<b>External Income</b>	<b>(1,246)</b>		<b>(1004)</b>	<b>(1102)</b>	<b>(1117)</b>

It can be seen that direct costs have reduced, in real terms, by some 17% in the first five years of the agreement, whilst external income has

fallen by 19% in the same period. Therefore, although the Partnership was formed to take advantage of a highly competitive expanding market in a major regeneration area of North Kent; it has proved to be equally successful in dealing with the outcomes and pressures of the economic downturn since 2008. It has been able to mitigate much of the pressure which would have been evident had services remained in-house in small units.

### Resilience

- 4.4 One of the main objectives was to build in increased resilience to the service and this has been possible by the increased pool of surveyors which are able to cover peaks in demand anywhere in the three council areas. It has allowed for a greater range of times of when surveyors can carry out site inspections making for a much more responsive customer facing inspection service allowing early morning and late afternoon visits to fit in with the customer's build time frame.
- 4.5 The Partnership is able to deliver a 24 hour, 365 day out of hours emergency service to all three councils for dangerous structures and boarding-up properties and is able to call upon a number of experienced surveyors in the event of a major incident. It represents each council on relevant Safety Advisory Groups and has an improved access to contractors when works have to be carried out under emergency powers.

### Staff development

- 4.6 Being a larger group has also allowed for greater opportunities for staff development with sufficient cover available to allow staff to attend training courses, learn new skills, enhance existing knowledge and maintain professional CPD.
- 4.7 Following the economic downturn in 2008, the construction industry was particularly hard hit and has shown little signs of recovery since. In order to mitigate pressure this would put on the Partnership's budget it was important to identify new income streams that would supplement a reduced building control income. This was possible by the introduction and development of a consultancy which would be able to deliver additional services and generate additional income. In order to facilitate the consultancy it has been imperative to diversify the roles of staff to enhance existing expertise or develop career related skills so as to be able to take advantage of changing markets and demand. The range of services now being offered include: Code for Sustainable Homes Assessment, Standard Assessment Procedure (SAPs) and Energy Performance Certificate Assessments (EPCs), Trade-Off Energy Calculations, Party Wall Surveying, Fire Risk Assessment, Access Statements and Clerk of Works roles for the Decent Homes programme and Condition Surveys regarding council housing stock.

- 4.8 The Partnership has been able to use its larger resource to develop both individuals and groups of individuals to deliver these services across both the professional and technical staff. They have also been able to share some of this additional knowledge with architects, developers and partners through a number of successful seminars which have taken place through the years and form the basis of shared understanding of complex construction techniques between surveyors and their customers.

#### Flexibility

- 4.9 One of the strengths of the Partnership has been its ability to adjust quickly to change in economic situations and market conditions. It has continued to look at ways of improving the service to customers whilst keeping costs to a minimum. Its detached position allows for negotiation of service level agreements with service providers so as to reduce costs and has achieved this with IT, Finance, Legal and HR.
- 4.10 It has been extremely important to adhere to a marketing strategy to maintain market share as competition for a shrinking market has increased since 2008. There has been a shift away from the commercial and industrial sectors by Approved Inspectors (AI's) as these areas have been hardest hit by the recession and the AI's have directed their energies into competing in the residential and domestic markets.
- 4.11 The Partnership has been able to maintain and expand its customer base on delivering a first class service. A customer survey carried out in June 2011 demonstrated a high degree of satisfaction from architects, agents and developers. The results of which are now displayed on the Partnership's website. From 2008 we became a Quality Assured company registered under ISO 9001:2008 and have had continued assessments through the BSI to retain the quality mark and match the quality assured requirements of many of our commercial customers.
- 4.12 The Partnership aims for continued improvement in the service and will be looking to enhance its IT offer to customers so that they can track their applications through the building control process and carry out search enquiries online. Both Members and officers have considered whether the consultancy should be developed as a Local Authority Company. Whilst at its inception it would not have been the appropriate time, as the consultancy increases its service and its income generation this aspect will be reviewed. There is also potential for the Partnership as a whole to be converted into a Local Authority Company and this would also be examined in a second term.
- 4.13 The Business Plan itself outlines how the building control function will be delivered on behalf of the three Partnership Council's up until 2014 and indicates what the reduced contributions will be up until 2015.

4.14 Following the approval of the draft at Joint Committee in September 2011, the opportunity has been taken to update a number of the charts with half yearly data, amending the text where necessary. There have been no further amendments following the 35 day consultation period with the three authorities.

4.15 The plan presented to Members for final consideration indicates the five agreed objectives with the second objective being amended at Members request to incorporate pursuing the expansion of the Partnership through the addition of new Partners:

- To improve customer satisfaction by providing an effective and efficient administration and site inspection regime in particularly through improved use of information technology and communication.
- To raise the profile of STG by developing a dynamic marketing strategy and pursuing the expansion of the Partnership through additional partners.
- To provide a healthy, safe and accessible built environment, reducing the carbon footprint and contributing to sustainable construction.
- To provide additional services through a consultancy to effectively compete with the private sector and generate additional income.
- To reduce contributions by partner authorities by 30% over 4 year period (2011/15).

The plan also includes action plans and targets to achieve these objectives.

Our key projects for 2012/13 will be:

- Ensure all three partner authorities are ready to sign up for second term on 01 October 2012 (subject to approval from all three partners).
- Adopt or adapt IT system to deliver IT Strategy objectives.
- Enable customer self-service for tracking and searches.
- Increase use of mobile technology with the ability to update in real-time
- Increase income from consultancy services by 5% over the 2011/12 figure.
- Re-examine case for consultancy becoming a Local Authority Company.
- Production of home and commercial owners packs to explain roles and responsibilities for each party within the building regulation process

4.16 In order to meet the requirements of each authority's reducing budgets we have reduced contributions by 34.42% over the four year life span

of the business and financial plan reducing the percentage of contributions by 2% each year for 2011/12 onwards. Given the economic forecasts are still pessimistic with regard to growth in the construction market we have had to do this against a backdrop of low income expectations. Further staff rationalisation and savings on support and supplies and services costs have allowed for this reduction in contribution costs giving a total reduction of £130k between 2011 and March 2015. Details of the financial plan 2011-15 are shown in Appendix 2.

- 4.17 A Diversity Impact Assessment screening form has been completed and is attached at Appendix 3. This found that the Business Plan did not require a full Diversity Impact Assessment.

## 5. Risk Management

- 5.1 This is detailed in Section 3 of the Way forward section of the Business Plan and focuses on a lack of recovery in the economic situation and an inability to sustain growth as well as a lack of investment in staff development and IT solutions.
- 5.2 There are a number of considerations should one or more of the partners decide to leave the Partnership and these are examined in the Options section of the report together with a number of other issues contained in the Business Plan.

## 6. Consultation

- 6.1 The draft Business Plan has been agreed by the Joint Committee of the three Partner Authorities on 8 December 2011 and is being presented to all three partner authorities.

## 7. Financial and legal implications

- 7.1 Section 2 of the Way Forward section of the Business Plan details the budget for 2012/15. It is now proposed to reduce total partner contributions over the life of the plan by 34.42% giving a reduction in total contributions of £130,777 by 2014/15.
- 7.2 The constituent authorities are required to make contributions to fund non-fee earning activities. These contributions are shown in the table below.

	<u>2012/13</u>	<u>2013/14</u>	<u>2014/15</u>
	£	£	£
Gravesham	70,354	65,424	60,300
Medway	186,439	173,374	159,794
Swale	94,978	88,323	81,405
Total	<u>351,772</u>	<u>327,121</u>	<u>301,498</u>



- 7.3 The Memorandum of Agreement, which underpins the Partnership, states “each Council shall notify the Partnership no later than 28 February in each year the amount the Council has allocated to the Partnership from its revenue budget”. For Medway the sum of £186,439 has been provided for in the 2012/13 draft budget.
- 7.4 The draft Business Plan makes provision for Partnership working with private architects. This will be done under the recognised Local Authority Building Control Partnership scheme. The Joint Committee has approved the Partnership undertaking consultancy work under the powers of Section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000.
- 7.5 The Memorandum of Agreement expires on 30 September 2012 and if a new Memorandum of Agreement is not approved and signed, the services will need to return to each constituent Authority. The implications of this are set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

## **8. Recommendations**

- 8.1 That Cabinet agrees that Medway continues in the Partnership for a second five year term and enters into a further Memorandum of Agreement for five years from 1 October 2012.
- 8.2 That Cabinet authorises the Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth, to take all necessary actions to enable the proposals for the second term of the Partnership, including all necessary legal agreements, to be finalised and implemented.
- 8.3 That Cabinet agrees the proposed business plan for 2011/14 (incorporating Financial Plan 2011-2015) for the South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership and that the proposed contribution of £186,439 from Medway be noted.

## **9. Suggested reasons for decision(s)**

- 9.1 The Constitution of the Joint Committee requires approval of the Business Plan for the following year by the Cabinet of each Partner Authority and each authority requires approval of Cabinet to carry on to a second term

### **Lead officer contact**

Tony Van Veghel, Director, South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership, Compass Centre, Chatham Maritime, Kent, ME4 4YH  
Tel: 01634 331552  
e-mail: [tony.vanveghel@stgbc.org.uk](mailto:tony.vanveghel@stgbc.org.uk)

- Appendix 1 - Issues returning to in-house service
- Appendix 2 - Financial Plan
- Appendix 3 - Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form
- Exempt Appendix - Business Plan

### **Background papers**

Report to consider second term - Building Control Joint Committee Agenda and Minutes – 8 December 2011

Report to establish Joint Committee - Council – 26 July 2007

Report to establish Partnership - Cabinet – 12 December 2006

## Appendix 1

### Some of the issues to be considered returning the service in-house

- Staffs current contracted hours would need to be renegotiated to cover an individual authorities working arrangements.
- Staff would need to be reabsorbed into the authority and space found to accommodate a new section.
- Staff TUPE'd into the Partnership may have legal rights to consider.
- Over the first term of the Partnership a number of staff members have left from each of the constituent authorities. Each authority would require to restructure its section, restaffing any vacancies, to deliver an adequate service as there would be no opportunity to resource against demand as there is in the current arrangement.
- IT hardware and other assets would have to be reallocated as per the asset register and new equipment purchased to fill any voids.
- A number of consumables which have been purchased collectively would need to be redistributed to each authority, however, at present there is no agreed method of distribution.
- A number of staff have contracted through the Partnership to be supplied with lease vehicles and these contracts would need to be accepted by the individual authority.
- New software licences and/or systems would have to be purchased and tested for integration with each authority's own software provision.
- Data extraction would be required to return data to individual authority's databases and a consequent cost implication.
- Filing space would have to be found for live files.
- Direct and indirect costs would increase as SLA's would be replaced with recharges and there would be a consequent loss of economies of scale.
- Current arrangements for dangerous structure 24 hour, 365 day cover would cease and be replaced with previous arrangements which did not provide the same cover at each authority.
- There would be less of an opportunity to provide additional services to generate additional income and compete with the private sector.
- Current licences allowing consultancy services are registered to individuals therefore once they return to their authority it would not be possible to deliver the same services from each authority and until training and development take place consultancy provision would have to cease.
- Current legal agreements with customers for Code for Sustainable Homes contracts may continue over a number of years until completion of the development and cost of those contracts would have to be honoured by the individual authority.
- There would be a consequent loss of opportunity to develop staff or adhere to a marketing strategy to maintain and win market share.
- There would also be further legal and contract issues regarding current leased equipment.



## Appendix 2

### Financial Plan

#### Three Year Budget Build and Contribution Calculation For 2012/2013 - 2014/2015

	<u>2010/11 Budget</u>	<u>2011/12 Budget</u>	<u>2012/13 Budget</u>	<u>2013/14 Budget</u>	<u>2014/15 Budget</u>	<u>Budget Savings 2010/11 to 2011/12</u>	<u>Budget Savings 2011/12 to 2012/13</u>	<u>Budget Increase 2012/13 to 2013/14</u>	<u>Budget Increase 2013/14 to 2014/15</u>	<u>Total Cumulative Savings</u>
Staffing	1,277,085	1,113,858	1,093,010	1,108,188	1,121,629	163,227	20,848	-15,178	-13,441	155,456
Premises	95,624	95,624	102,346	102,346	102,346	0	-6,722	0	0	-6,722
Transport	58,940	55,740	48,580	48,580	48,580	3,200	7,160	0	0	10,360
Supplies and Services	98,875	114,940	104,942	104,942	104,942	-16,065	9,998	0	0	-6,067
Support Services	70,498	70,498	58,210	58,210	58,210	0	12,288	0	0	12,288
<b>Total Cost:</b>	<b>1,601,022</b>	<b>1,450,660</b>	<b>1,407,088</b>	<b>1,422,266</b>	<b>1,435,707</b>	<b>150,362</b>	<b>43,572</b>	<b>-15,178</b>	<b>-13,441</b>	<b>165,315</b>
						<b>9.39%</b>	<b>3.00%</b>	<b>-1.08%</b>	<b>-0.95%</b>	<b>10.37%</b>
Contributions	-432,276	-391,678	-351,772	-327,121	-301,498					
Fee Income	-1,168,746	-1,102,052	-1,102,052	-1,117,052	-1,147,052					
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>-1,601,022</b>	<b>-1,493,730</b>	<b>-1,453,824</b>	<b>-1,444,173</b>	<b>-1,448,550</b>					
<b>Net (surplus) / deficit</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-43,070</b>	<b>-46,736</b>	<b>-21,907</b>	<b>-12,843</b>					
<b>Contribution Calculation</b>	<b>2010/11 Budget</b>	<b>2011/12 Budget</b>	<b>2012/13 Budget</b>	<b>2013/14 Budget</b>	<b>2014/15 Budget</b>					
Fee Earning 79%					1,134,209					
Non Fee Earning 21%					301,498					
					<b>1,435,707</b>					
Fee Earning 77%				1,095,145						
Non Fee Earning 23%				327,121						
				<b>1,422,266</b>						
Fee Earning 75%			1,055,316							
Non Fee Earning 25%			351,772							
			<b>1,407,088</b>							
Fee Earning 73%	1,168,746	1,058,982								
Non Fee Earning 27%	432,276	391,678								
	<b>1,601,022</b>	<b>1,450,660</b>								
<b>Authority And Agreed Percentage</b>	<b>2010/11 Budget</b>	<b>2011/12 Budget</b>	<b>2012/13 Budget</b>	<b>2013/14 Budget</b>	<b>2014/15 Budget</b>	<b>Reduction In Contribution From 2010/11 to 2011/12</b>	<b>Reduction In Contribution From 2011/12 to 2012/13</b>	<b>Reduction In Contribution From 2012/13 to 2013/14</b>	<b>Reduction In Contribution From 2013/14 to 2014/15</b>	<b>Total Cumulative Reduction In Contribution</b>
Gravesham 20%	86,455	78,336	70,354	65,424	60,300	8,120	7,981	4,930	5,125	26,155
Swale 27%	116,715	105,753	94,978	88,323	81,405	10,961	10,775	6,656	6,918	35,310
Medway 53%	229,106	207,589	186,439	173,374	159,794	21,517	21,150	13,065	13,580	69,312
	<b>432,276</b>	<b>391,678</b>	<b>351,772</b>	<b>327,121</b>	<b>301,498</b>	<b>40,598</b>	<b>39,906</b>	<b>24,651</b>	<b>25,623</b>	<b>130,777</b>
						<b>9.39%</b>	<b>10.19%</b>	<b>7.01%</b>	<b>7.83%</b>	<b>34.42%</b>



## Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form

<b>Directorate Regeneration Culture and Community</b>	<b>Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change</b> <b>Building Control Partnership</b>		
Officer responsible for assessment Tony Van Veghel	Date of assessment 12 September 2011	New or existing? Existing	
<b>Defining what is being assessed</b>			
<b>1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives</b>	To ensure compliance with the Building Act 1984 by enforcing the Building Regulations across three boroughs. Deal with dangerous structures, demolitions, unauthorised work. Provide discretionary services through a consultancy.		
<b>2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?</b>	Residents, businesses and visitors to Medway.		
<b>3. What outcomes are wanted?</b>	A healthy, safe and sustainable environment.		
<b>4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>	Contribute  Resources available from the Partnership. Support from the three constituent Authorities.	Detract  Competition from the private sector. Economic climate.	
<b>5. Who are the main stakeholders?</b>	The three boroughs in the Partnership, Medway, Gravesham and Swale. Property owners, businesses, developers and architects.		
<b>6. Who implements this and who is responsible?</b>	No third parties are involved.		

<b>Assessing impact</b>		
<b>7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial groups</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes compared against the private sector.	
<b>8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation although disabled people or their carers are not charged a fee under the exemptions in the Charges legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes from the private sector.	
<b>9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes compared against the private sector.	
<b>10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes compared against the private sector.	
<b>11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes compared against the private sector.	



12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's age?	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes compared against the private sector.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being transgendered or transsexual</i> ?	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes compared against the private sector.	
14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. people with caring responsibilities or dependants, those with an offending past, or people living in rural areas)?	YES	If yes, which group(s)?
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes compared against the private sector.	
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	All applications are processed in accordance with The Building Act 1984 and Building Regulations 2010 legislation. All enquiries for consultancy services are based on competitive quotes compared against the private sector.	
<b>Conclusions &amp; recommendation</b>		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	YES	Please explain
	NO	Not applicable

Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?		
<b>NO</b>	This function/ policy/ service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.	
<b>NO, BUT ...</b>	<b>What is required to ensure this complies with the requirements of the legislation? (see DIA Guidance Notes)?</b>	<p>Minor modifications necessary (e.g. change of 'he' to 'he or she', re-analysis of way routine statistics are reported)</p> <p>Since April 2009 information has been collected on diversity. However, the number of responses is noted to be extremely low and the process was reviewed in April 2010 and the issue discussed with the Research and Review team during training for all staff on diversity. It was felt that more one-to-one surveys may be more productive and this is planned for 2011/12.</p> <p>Successful survey carried out in June 2011 generating 74% return on monitoring diversity survey. Results and outcomes to be discussed with Research and Review team by end of December 2011. Second survey planned for June 2012.</p>
<b>YES</b>	<b>Give details of key person responsible and target date for carrying out full impact assessment (see DIA Guidance Notes)</b>	

Action plan to make Minor modifications		
Outcome	Actions (with date of completion)	Officer responsible
Better understanding about applicants community identity	<p>To implement dedicated one-to-one survey during one week in each half of the financial year.</p> <p>By April 2012</p>	Tony Van Veghel
Determine if any changes are necessary to working practices as a result of questionnaire feedback	<p>Results and outcomes from survey to be reported to Joint Committee and discussed with Research and Review team</p> <p>By December 2012</p>	Tony Van Veghel

<b>Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review</b>	
<b>Date of next review</b>	September 2012
<b>Areas to check at next review (e.g. new census information, new legislation due)</b>	Validity and depth of information gathered.

<b>Is there <i>another</i> group (e.g. new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?</b>	No	
<b>Signed (completing officer/service manager)</b>  Tony Van Veghel	<b>Date</b>	12/09/11
<b>Signed (service manager/Assistant Director)</b>  Stephen Gaimster	<b>Date</b>	15/09/11