

# Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

## Informing our approach to fairness

<b>Name of proposal</b>	Leisure Centres – Kenton Park and Newburn
<b>Date of original assessment</b>	1 December 2015
<b>Lead officer</b>	Su Cumming
<b>Assessment team</b>	Su Cumming
<b>Review date</b>	January 2017

### Version control

<b>Version</b>	3
<b>Date</b>	4 October 2016
<b>Replaces version</b>	2

This is our assessment of the potential equality and other impacts of this 2017-18 budget proposal, based on the available evidence. It is a 'living document' and we will review it throughout the consultation period. A formal review will take place on all proposals when consultation closes to consider comments and information from all stakeholders, research or new and emerging policy.

## Section A: Current service

### 1. What does the service do?

All leisure facilities across Newcastle are run or managed independently by third party organisations.

In 2015 we transferred the management of our remaining four leisure facilities to North Country Leisure with the exception of Elswick Pool which was closed in 2015. We still hope to agree a way forward with a local group to re-open it again in the coming year. All formally managed council leisure facilities are now run by North Country Leisure with the exception of Kenton Park Sports Centre and Newburn Activity Centre

#### **Newburn Activity Centre**

Newburn Recreational and Riverside Association (NRRA), is a registered charity responsible for running Newburn Activity Centre (NAC).

Prior to 2015 we provided staff to NAC, the only remaining facility to be run by council staff following the transfer of all other facilities to North Council Leisure. Negotiations were started with NRRA in 2013 to enable them to take over the staffing of the building. Following extensive negotiations, a smooth transition took place from April 2015, and NRRA now employ all staff at the centre. NRAA hold a lease for the building which was signed in 1991 and is due to expire in 2033 leaving them 17 years under the current terms

The basis of the transfer of staffing NAC was for us to continue paying an annual grant to NRRA to enable them to employ staff and deliver services. The grant represented a saving for us because it was less than the level of subsidy which was provided to NAC at the time, though we did indicate that this grant would be subject to review. In 2015/16 it was agreed that the grant to NAC would be removed entirely however following consultation, transitional funding of £144,300 was put in place for one year to help NAC develop a sustainable business model.

NAC runs all the normal activities associated with a leisure centre, including an active outdoor programme based on outdoor river activities. In addition NAC delivers bespoke activities to disabled people across the city. This regularly attracts over 100 disabled people and their carers. This function could not easily transfer to another centre because of the specialist equipment that has been bought and installed at NAC (much of which is lottery funded).

#### **Kenton Park Sports Centre**

Kenton Park Community Association (KPCA) a registered charity responsible for the management of Kenton Park Sports centre.

The management of the facility transferred from us to KPCA in 1990. The management committee hold the lease of the building which was expanded in 2015 to include outdoor space, small football facilities and some areas of the adjacent park. The lease has 23 years left to run.

KPCA employ their own staff and run and maintain the centre and nearby football pitches and bowling green with the help of a subsidy we provide. In 2015/16 it was agreed that the grant to KPCA would be removed entirely however following consultation, transitional funding of £72,590 was put in place for one year to help them develop a sustainable business model which would allow them to become self sufficient in 2017/18.

The centre offers a wide range of well supported community based activities with a focus on work with health related activities such as health referral programmes Why Weight and Live Well, older people's activities associated with the local sheltered accommodation, gym, fitness

classes, StreetGames and community cohesion projects for young people as well as more traditional support for sports clubs.

**2. Who do you deliver this service for?**

Both centres are open to anyone who wishes to use them although the users come from the local community or neighbouring areas.

NAC which has much larger facilities, including outdoor facilities, and carparking which attracts customers from across the city.

Both centres provide a number of schools programmes, specialist events and classes aimed specifically at targeted groups, in particular disabled people where both centres have specialist equipment and deliver to disability groups and schools

**3. Do you have any statutory requirements?**

There are no statutory requirements for the council to provide leisure activities in the city.

**4. How much do you spend on this service?**

Gross expenditure	Gross income	Net budget	Capital projects
£216,890		£216,890	

**5.**

Posts	FTEs	Comments
0	0	No staff are directly employed by the council.

**Section B: Change proposal**

**1. What is the proposal to change the service?**

The constraints of our budget has meant we propose to remove the subsidy to NAC and KPCA. Both facilities deliver a range of sport and physical activities services to people across their local communities. Following consultation in 2015/16 we awarded transition funding for 2016/17 made up from unspent ward budgets and historic underspends for one year to allow both centres to develop a medium term sustainable business model (from 2017/18 onwards).

One of the conditions attached to the transition funding was that each organisation would produce a business plan and position statement by the end of October 2016 outlining how they intend to become self sufficient and what changes may take place to their services to accommodate this. Once we have had the opportunity to discuss the business plans with both organisations we will work with them to identify alternative sources of funding and income opportunities. This impact assessment will be updated during the period of consultation to reflect any changes to the proposal or impacts identified.

**2. What evidence has informed this proposal?**

Information source	What has this told you?
2015/16 budget proposal	That the budget would be removed at the end of 2016/17 financial year.

**3. How much will you spend on this service?**

	Gross expenditure	Gross income	Net budget	Capital projects
<b>2016/17</b>	£216,890		£216,890	

**4. What will the net savings be of this proposal?**

	Gross Saving	Implementation Cost	Net Saving
<b>2016/17</b>	£216,890		£216,890

**4. What impact will this have on the workforce?**

	No. FTEs	% workforce
<b>2016/17</b>	N/A	N/A

<b>5. Who have you engaged with about this proposal?</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>No. of people</b>	<b>Main issues raised</b>
Oct 2016	Follow up discussion with NRAA	NRRA management team	In 2015 NRRA advised that they would be unable to cope with the scale of the funding reduction and that there was a possibility that the centre would be unable to remain open were these proposals agreed. Transition funding was agreed to support the association through this funding change and to allow them to develop a new business plan NRRA are required to provide a business plan in Oct 2016 to allow us to develop an understanding of the financial position of the association and how they intend to deal with the and the opportunity to discuss how we may be able to support them to develop their plans further
Oct 2016	Consultation with Kenton Park Community Association	KPCA Management Team	In 2015 KPCA advised that they would be unable to cope with the scale of the funding reduction and that there was a possibility that the centre would be unable to remain open were these proposals agreed. Transition funding was agreed to support the association through this funding change and to allow them to develop a new business plan KPCA are required to provide a business plan in Oct 2016 to allow us to develop an understanding of the financial position of the association and how they intend to deal with the and the opportunity to discuss how we may be able to support them to develop their plans further
Various in 2015	Customer Consultation	19	Feedback included concerns that the proposals would impact on the ability of the centres to remain open whilst some consultees were concerned that any potential reduction in funding would affect the ability of both facilities to deliver important community and specialist sessions including those for disabled and older people.

<b>6. What are the potential impacts of the proposal?</b>				
<b>Staff / service users</b>	<b>Specific group / subject</b>	<b>Impact</b> (actual / potential disadvantage, beneficial outcome or none)	<b>Detail of impact</b>	<b>How will you address or mitigate disadvantage?</b>
<b>People with protected characteristics</b>				
Service users	Younger people (age)	Actual/potential disadvantage	<p>A reduction in operational hours may impact access for schools and holiday programmes for young people at both facilities as well as access to clubs and teams outside of school times</p> <p>If the facilities were to close there would be reduced opportunities for children to access the services offered by Newburn Activity Centre and Kenton Park Sports Centre. Both facilities provide key activity services to young people of all ages.</p>	<p>We are working with the management committees of both centres to identify ways to mitigate against the budget removal so they can continue to keep the centres operating and viable for the future.</p> <p>This includes supporting the organisations with their business plans, links with possible partners and working to make sure they are up to date with all the information on funding.</p> <p>Should the facilities close we will work with the groups to ensure alternative facilities are found with the minimum of disruption</p>
Service users	Older people (65+)	Actual/potential disadvantage	<p>Both facilities offer a range of sessions for older people which would not continue at their current level were the centres to reduce their operating hours and would cease should the centre close. This would reduce access to health and wellbeing services opportunities for older people.</p>	<p>We are working with the management committees of both centres to identify ways to mitigate against the budget removal so they can continue to keep the centres operating and viable for the future.</p> <p>This includes supporting the organisations with their business plans, links with possible partners and working</p>

6. What are the potential impacts of the proposal?				
Staff / service users	Specific group / subject	Impact (actual / potential disadvantage, beneficial outcome or none)	Detail of impact	How will you address or mitigate disadvantage?
				<p>to make sure they are up to date with all the information on funding.</p> <p>Should the facilities close we will work with the groups to ensure alternative facilities are found with the minimum of disruption</p>
Service users	Disabled people	Actual/potential disadvantage	<p>Both facilities offer activities to schools and users who have a disability.</p> <p>Newburn Activity Centre offers the largest range of activities for people with a disability and have a wide range of specific facilities including a multisensory room.</p> <p>Reduction of hours or closure of the sites site would mean reduced opportunities for disabled people to take part in activity.</p>	<p>We are working with the management committees of both centres to identify ways to mitigate against the budget removal so they can continue to keep the centres operating and viable for the future.</p> <p>This includes supporting the organisations with their business plans, links with possible partners and working to make sure they are up to date with all the information on funding.</p> <p>Should the facilities close we will work with the groups to ensure alternative facilities are found with the minimum of disruption</p>
Service users	Carers	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative		

<b>6. What are the potential impacts of the proposal?</b>				
<b>Staff / service users</b>	<b>Specific group / subject</b>	<b>Impact</b> (actual / potential disadvantage, beneficial outcome or none)	<b>Detail of impact</b>	<b>How will you address or mitigate disadvantage?</b>
		impact on people who are carers		
Service users	People who are married or in civil partnerships	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people who are married or are in civil partnerships		
Service users	Sex or gender (including transgender, pregnancy and maternity)	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their gender		
Service users	People's sexual orientation	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their sexual orientation		
Service users	People of different races	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that		

6. What are the potential impacts of the proposal?				
Staff / service users	Specific group / subject	Impact (actual / potential disadvantage, beneficial outcome or none)	Detail of impact	How will you address or mitigate disadvantage?
		the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people of any particular race		
Service users	People who have different religions or beliefs	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their religious belief		
Service users	People living in deprived areas	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people who live in deprived areas	Kenton Park Community Centre is situated in an area with above average levels of deprivation. Loss of the facility and reduced access will impact the level of activity families from the communities in the wards have access to. Facilities in neighbouring wards provide similar but more expensive activities and are much further to travel.	<p>We are working with the management committees of both centres to identify ways to mitigate against the budget removal so they can continue to keep the centres operating and viable for the future.</p> <p>This includes supporting the organisations with their business plans, links with possible partners and working to make sure they are up to date with all the information on funding.</p> <p>Should the facilities close we will work with the groups to ensure alternative facilities are found with the minimum of disruption</p>

6. What are the potential impacts of the proposal?				
Staff / service users	Specific group / subject	Impact (actual / potential disadvantage, beneficial outcome or none)	Detail of impact	How will you address or mitigate disadvantage?
Service users	People in low paid employment or in households with low incomes	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people from low income households	<p>Kenton Park Community Centre is situated in an area with households on low incomes and Newburn provides some activities which support the local communities living in areas with low household income.</p> <p>Loss of the facility and reduced access will impact the level of activity families from the communities in the wards have access to. Facilities in neighbouring wards provide similar but more expensive activities and are much further to travel.</p>	<p>We are working with the management committees of both centres to identify ways to mitigate against the budget removal so they can continue to keep the centres operating and viable for the future.</p> <p>This includes supporting the organisations with their business plans, links with possible partners and working to make sure they are up to date with all the information on funding.</p> <p>Should the facilities close we will work with the groups to ensure alternative facilities are found with the minimum of disruption</p>
Service users	People facing barriers to gaining employment, such as low levels of educational attainment	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people facing barriers to employment		
Service users	Looked after children	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a		

<b>6. What are the potential impacts of the proposal?</b>				
<b>Staff / service users</b>	<b>Specific group / subject</b>	<b>Impact</b> (actual / potential disadvantage, beneficial outcome or none)	<b>Detail of impact</b>	<b>How will you address or mitigate disadvantage?</b>
		disproportionately negative impact on Looked after Children		
Service users	People facing multiple deprivation, through a combination of factors such as poor health or poor housing / homelessness	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact people facing multiple deprivation		
N/A	Businesses providing current or future jobs in the city	Actual/potential disadvantage	Closure of Newburn or Kenton centres would lead to job losses of the staff currently employed there.	We are working to develop the business plan which we hope will minimise any risk to jobs or employment at the facilities. Should it be required we will advise and support the management committees to have an understanding of managing any of the risks associated with staffing reduction or redundancy
Service users	Area, wards, neighbourhoods	Actual/potential disadvantage	The closure of Newburn or Kenton would leave no full time publically accessible leisure facilities in their respective ward/area.	In working to develop the business plan we will support the organisations to work with other who may be able to support or assist in the delivery of the service or share resources. Both have large schools in their wards that have some community sports facilities so should the

<b>6. What are the potential impacts of the proposal?</b>				
<b>Staff / service users</b>	<b>Specific group / subject</b>	<b>Impact</b> (actual / potential disadvantage, beneficial outcome or none)	<b>Detail of impact</b>	<b>How will you address or mitigate disadvantage?</b>
				facility have to close we would work to support the existing users to access the closest facilities
<b>Service users</b>				
Service users	Community cohesion	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on community cohesion		
<b>Community safety</b>				
N/A	Community safety	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on community safety		
<b>Environment</b>				
N/A				