

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Informing our approach to fairness

Name of proposal	Baltic 39
Date of original assessment	September 2016
Lead officer	Andrew Rothwell
Assessment team	Andrew Rothwell
Review date	September 2017

Version control

Version	2
Date	3 February 2017
Replaces version	1

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'. We have reviewed this assessment following a period of consultation and will continue to review it as we implement the proposal.

Section A: Current service

1. What does the service do?

Baltic 39 is a contemporary art and creative industries facility based at 31 – 39 High Bridge in Newcastle city centre. It houses:

- The Stand Comedy Club (basement);
- Reception and meeting spaces studios for Northumbria University Fine Art post-graduates and Fellows (ground floor);
- Teaching and studio-space for Northumbria University Fine Art post-graduates (first floor);
- 32 studio spaces for fine artists and creative businesses (second & third floors); and
- A gallery (fourth floor).

The building is owned by Newcastle City Council and was acquired and developed using funds provided by the council, Arts Lottery (through Arts Council England), the European Union (ERDF), One North East and trusts and foundations, including the Northern Rock Foundation and the Sir John Knott Trust. It opened in April 2012.

The Stand and Northumbria University are 'anchor' tenants, each of which has a 25-year lease on the space(s) they occupy. The 32 studio spaces are occupied by individual artists and creative businesses on renewable three-year licences. The gallery is licenced to BALTIC, Centre for the Contemporary Arts, which programmes and manages the space.

Baltic 39 aims to be the focal point for production, exhibition and development of the contemporary visual arts and related creative industries in Newcastle city centre and an incubator for innovation and growth in the sector.

The management of Baltic 39 is the responsibility of the council, who's Service Support Assistants (SSAs) open and close the building each day, and who coordinate and commission day-to-day maintenance and cleaning. The council is also responsible for identifying and engaging studio-holders and for day-to-day liaison with them. Front-of-House and reception staff are provided, on contract, by BALTIC. The current agreements with BALTIC for staffing and gallery programming and management will expire at the end of the 2016/7 financial year.

The five principal stakeholders in the facility (the City Council, Northumbria University, BALTIC, The Stand and studio-holders) meet on a monthly basis to coordinate their activities.

2. Who do you deliver this service for?

Baltic 39 was developed:

- To provide affordable workspace in the city centre for both established and emerging talent in the fine arts and creative industries;
- To retain talent in the city and in particular to enhance the retention of graduates in the fine arts and creative industries; and
- To provide access to the best contemporary visual art to the general public, recognising that exhibitions and other activities (including debates, Continuing Professional Development and educational opportunities) were unlikely to have mass appeal but were held in high esteem by niche markets.

3. Do you have any statutory requirements?

There are no statutory requirements

4. How much do you spend on this service?			
Gross expenditure	Gross income	Net budget	Capital projects
£350,000	£200,000	£150,000	0

5. What workforce delivers this service?		
Posts	FTEs	Comments
Service Support Assistants (SSAs)	1	1 member of library staff 7.30am – 9.00am; 1 member of library staff 6.00pm – 9.00pm
Cleaner	1	

Section B: Change proposal

1. What is the proposal to change the service?

It is proposed that alternative ownership and management models for the building should be explored and if any risks and benefits associated with running it should be transferred to a third party which is sympathetic to the aims that inspired its acquisition and development. An options appraisal is currently in progress.

Change of use is not a viable option: the grant aid received from the Arts Lottery, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and One North East (whose responsibilities have now transferred to the Housing and Communities Agency (HCA)) to develop the building, have prohibitively costly clawback conditions which apply for up to 21 years.

It is envisaged that although the ownership and management of the facility may change, the range and quality of services available to the creative sector and the public will remain as they are at present.

2. What evidence has informed this proposal?

Information source	What has this told you?
Management accounts and information	That the sum currently earmarked by the City Council to bridge the gap between income and expenditure can no longer be sustained. The provision (£150,000 pa) is, in any case, larger than required: the gap has been lower in each of the last three years and has been reducing. It is anticipated that it may have been closed by the end of this financial year. Opportunities to increase income and reduce expenditure have also been identified.

3. How much will you spend on this service?

	Gross expenditure	Gross income	Net budget	Capital projects
2017/8	£250,000	£250,000	£0	£0

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

	Gross Saving	Implementation Cost	Net Saving
2017/18	£150,000	£0	£150,000

5. What impact will this have on the workforce?

	No. FTEs	% workforce	We are exploring alternative arrangements for existing post holders.
2017/8	2	100	

6. Who have you engaged with about this proposal?				
Date	Who	No. of people	Main issues raised	
	BALTIC, Centre for the Contemporary Arts	3	Finance and the terms and conditions of any transfer	
	Northumbria University	3	Finance and the terms and conditions of any transfer	
	Newcastle Council for Voluntary Services		NCVS were generally supportive of exploring different ownership and management models. NCVS suggested that this approach could be used more widely, as part of a different approach in using city centre buildings as a hub for supporting creative and community organisations. Examples given included Broadacre House, Bamburgh House / Breeze, Norwich Union House, and some of the shop fronts in East Pilgrim Street and New Bridge Street.	
7. 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?
People with protected characteristics				
Service users	Younger people and / or older people (age)	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their age	
Service users	Disabled people	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their disability	

	Carers	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because they are carers	
	People who are married or in civil partnerships	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their marital status	
	Sex or gender (including transgender, pregnancy and maternity)	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their gender	
	People's sexual orientation	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their sexual orientation	
	People of different races	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their race	
	People who have different religions or beliefs	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a	

			disproportionately negative impact on people because of their religion or belief	
People vulnerable to socio-economic disadvantage				
	People living in deprived areas	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of where they live	
	People in low paid employment or in households with low incomes	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their income	
	People facing barriers to gaining employment, such as low levels of educational attainment	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people because of their educational achievement	
	Looked after children	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on looked after children	
	People facing multiple deprivation, through a combination of factors such as poor health or poor housing / homelessness	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on people facing multiple deprivation	

Businesses				
	Businesses providing current or future jobs in the city	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on businesses	
Geography				
	Area, wards, neighbourhoods	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on any specific area or ward	
Community cohesion				
	Community cohesion	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on community cohesion	
Community safety				
	Community safety	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a disproportionately negative impact on community safety	
Environment				
	Environment	None	Based on our engagement feedback and research, there is no evidence to suggest the proposal will have a	

			disproportionately negative impact on the environment	
--	--	--	---	--