

BUDGET CUT ASSESSMENT FORM

W5

Budget Cut Assessment Form COCKERTON LIBRARY	Ref No W5	Responsible AD	Responsible Finance Manager	Responsible HR Manager	Responsible Lawyer	Responsible EIA Officer
<p>Description of Proposal:</p> <p>Cockerton Library is the only branch library within Darlington and in recent years has had a reduction in opening hours and during 2014/15 into 2015/16 discussions have been carried out with the voluntary sector to try to develop a volunteer-led library within Cockerton. To date this has not proved successful and the Council continues to manage the library. There were approximately 86,888 books loaned from Cockerton during 2014/15 and alongside book lending there are 10 computer terminals for use by library members providing 280 hours of access per week. The total number of visits to Cockerton Library in 2014 was 42,050.</p> <p>Proposal: Cockerton Library would be closed.</p> <p>Impact: The closure of the library would impact significantly on residents who regularly use the service. A full needs assessment would need to be carried out prior to any final decision being made. There will be a requirement to complete a Library Needs Assessment and full Equalities Impact Assessment prior to Members making any final decisions</p>						
Human Resources Impacts		Asset Management Impacts	Decommissioning Costs		Cost Shunting	
No. of posts to be deleted	1.6	Detail any released buildings/building space Identify disposal or requisition issues The building could be disposed of and land sold for other purposes.	In addition to HR and Asset costs identify any others e.g. early contract termination costs Demolition, to be confirmed. Boarding up, to be confirmed. There would be an annual cost of approximately £8,000 per year associated with rates, mothballing and maintenance until disposed of.		Is there any known or potential to increase costs elsewhere within Council budgets None.	
No. of potential redundancies	4					
Estimated Redundancy costs	£28,896					

	Financial Summary				
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Estimated reduction to budget	23,000	52,000	52,000	53,000	53,000
Redundancy Costs	29,000	0	0	0	0
Asset Implication					
Decommissioning Costs	4,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Known Cost Shunting					
Overheads	377	1,777	1,773	1,788	1,788
NET Budget Reduction	(9,623)	45,777	45,773	46,788	46,788

Equality Impacts

Overview is EIA needed?			Protected Characteristics								
Put 'x' in relevant box if the proposal:		'x'	Comments, including any charge across the options. Include the number of people affected, where known	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put 'x' in the box in the Impact column if there are positive (P) or negative (N) equality impacts. Leave box blank if there are no potential equality impacts Put L, M, H or ? in relevant column using following descriptions: L = sustainable adjustment in daily routine M = significant reorganisation or change H = life changing or limiting impact on quality of life ? = not known at this stage. 			Explain decision, level of impact and any change across the options		Yes	Brief Details	
Affects	Service users	x	Users of Cockerton Library would be affected by the closure.		Impact	Level					
	Employees	x	Due to other changes within the library service there would be limited, if any, opportunities for the staff at Cockerton.		P	N	L/M/H/?		Have Cumulative Impacts been identified?	x	There could be potentially cumulative impacts depending on what other decisions are taken around the library service.
	The wider community	x	There would be an impact on the wider community as local businesses benefit from dual visits to the secondary shopping area and library.	Age		x	L	Closing Cockerton Library would have an impact on the older population who use the service as they would need to use alternative provision within the town.	Have unlawful impacts been identified?		
Significantly affects how services are delivered?		x	There would be significant impact on the service as it would be stopped at Cockerton with the other available library services within the town centre.	Race				There would be no particular impact on individuals in this protected group.	Are there opportunities to advance equality?		
Have a significant effect on partner organisations?		x	There would be an impact on partner organisations who use the service.	Sex				There would be no particular impact on individuals in this protected group.	Are there opportunities to foster good relations?		
Affect services known to be important to particular protected groups?		x	The library service, either book lending, audio books or ICT use, is important to a range of people with protected characteristics.	Gender Reassignment				There would be no particular impact on individuals in this protected group.	Have any other options been explored and discounted?	x	Previously work has taken place with the voluntary sector to look to a volunteer led model at Cockerton, however to date this has not proved successful. This could again be further explored with other interested parties.
Affect different protected groups in different ways?		x	Depending on the individual protected characteristics, the closure would impact differently on different groups.	Disability		x	L	There could potentially be an impact on disabled individuals who use the service as Cockerton either through accessibility or using the services such as audio books and ICT.			
Relate to service areas with known inequalities				Religion or Belief				There would be no particular impact on individuals in this protected group.			
				Sexual Orientation				There would be no particular impact on individuals in this protected group.			
				Pregnancy or Maternity				There would be no particular impact on individuals in this protected group.			
				Marriage/Civil Partnership				There would be no particular impact on individuals in this protected group.			

MTEP – 2016/17 – Equality Screenings. This screening tool is to gather information on potential equality impacts to inform decision making. It is not an equality impact assessment. EIA will be done at a later stage where appropriate. All proposals must have an equality screen document. Decision makers must have equality screening information before any decision is taken. DBC is at risk of legal challenge if decision makers do not have this information.