

## Decision Report - Executive Decision

Forward Plan Reference: FP/24/01/26

Decision Date – 6/3/24

Key Decision – yes

Confidential Information – appendix



---

### Review of Outsourced Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing Services

Executive Member(s): Cllr Federica Smith Roberts - Lead Member for Communities, Housing and Culture

Local Member(s) and Division: All

Lead Officer: Sarah Dowden – Service Director for Regulatory and Operational

Author: Jonathan Stevens - Head of Operations, Regulatory & Operational Services

Contact Details: [sarah.dowden@somerset.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.dowden@somerset.gov.uk) / [jonathan.stevens@somerset.gov.uk](mailto:jonathan.stevens@somerset.gov.uk)

#### Summary / Background

1. This report updates members on the proposals for devolution and in sourcing at the end of the current contract arrangements for outsourced grounds maintenance and street scene services in the former Mendip, Taunton Deane and West Somerset districts.
2. All contracts are currently serviced by IDVerde. The contract in former West Somerset District council area expires on 30/11/2024, and for Taunton Deane, it expires on 31/1/2025. However, there is an automatic 3-year extension clause if the service has previously been delivered to a satisfactory standard. This is likely to be triggered.

The contract for the former Mendip District Council area expires in June 2025.

3. This report outlines officer progress on analysing costs savings and community benefits from a possible insourcing of the service, and how these impacts on the devolution agenda.
4. The council aims to align service delivery more closely with community needs, increase flexibility in adapting to evolving circumstances, and ensure a higher standard of quality and sustainability, either through direct delivery by Somerset Council or under an alternative devolution model.

5. It is the view of officers that both delivery models can deliver savings to Somerset Council.

### **Recommendations**

6. The Executive agrees:
  - a) To explore and agree devolution of services to town and parish councils at point of expiration of contracts.
  - b) To in source all remaining services under the contract that aren't devolved to town and parish councils at the point of contract expiration.
  - c) The case for applying exemption information provision as set out in the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A and therefore treat the attached confidential Appendix, as they contain commercially sensitive information, and as the case for the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing that information.
  - d) To exclude the press and public from the meeting where there is any discussion regarding confidential Appendix (to be treated as exempt information).

### **Reasons for recommendations**

7. With contracts due to expire, the Council needs to give notice to the contractor in good time that it does not wish to extend the contract beyond its current expiry date. Arrangements need to be put in place to ensure continuation of service.
8. As part of the Council's devolution programme, major towns covered by these contracts have expressed an interest in taking on services currently provided via the contractors either now or at the expiration of the contract.
9. Devolution of services supports the Council's devolution agenda and delivers savings to the Council.
10. To be able to devolve services, the Council needs control of its services. Outsourced arrangements are a barrier to delivering devolution. Depending on timings it may be that services need to be insourced initially to allow for devolution. It is hoped that the process can be aligned neatly to avoid this, but it is important to note that unless the Council has direct control over its services it cannot devolve them.

11. Where devolution agreements are not reached, the Council needs to ensure continuation of service at the expiration of the contract. This includes street cleansing, which is a statutory service. Officer analysis suggests that insourcing would be the best option, delivering both savings for the authority and better performance overall.
12. Two separate pieces of analysis undertaken by officers has suggested that savings can be made by in sourcing, particularly in the old Mendip area.
13. Information within this report is commercially sensitive due to the existing contractual agreements with IDVerde, and therefore the report should be treated as private and confidential.

#### **Other options considered**

14. Officers have considered the following alternative options:
  - a) Outsourcing of all depot services  
Somerset Council provides in sourced grounds maintenance and street cleansing services in the former South Somerset and Sedgemoor District Council areas, and in sourced grounds maintenance services only at the old Somerset West and Taunton area. Outsourcing of these services in line with the existing outsourced arrangements has been discounted as it takes control away from the Council and prevents it's from fulfilling its devolution agenda.
  - b) Extension of existing outsourced arrangements  
An extension of existing contract arrangements where it can be avoided has been discounted as it takes control away from the Council and prevents it from fulfilling its devolution agenda.
  - c) Full insourcing of existing outsourced arrangements  
A full analysis of insourcing all outsourced arrangements at the expiration of the contracts has taken place to understand the financial feasibility of the Council providing these services. The analysis suggests that this delivers a saving for the council whilst improving quality of delivery. However this option has been discounted in part in favour of devolving services where appropriate. This option remains as a mitigation for areas where devolution is not achieved.

## **Links to Council Plan and Medium-Term Financial Plan**

15. This decision links to the following Somerset Council Plan 2023-27 objectives:
- a) **A Greener, More Sustainable Somerset**  
City, Town and Parish Councils are key partners for delivering on the Council's climate emergency and nature emergency declarations. The ability to work more flexibly with these partners is vital, especially around grassland management and tree planting.
  - b) **A Fairer, Ambitious Somerset**  
City, town and parish councils are well placed to understand their local communities, and run their services to support this. The supports the Council's priority to reduce inequalities that cause this disparity, so everyone in Somerset can live their lives as they choose.  
A stated priority for Somerset Council is to reduce the inequalities that cause these disparities, so that everyone in Somerset can live their lives as they choose.
  - c) **A Flourishing and Resilient Somerset**  
Devolution of services to City, town and parish councils give these organisations the freedom to invest in their key open spaces and high streets to support the existing economy, increase the number of events and encourage visitors.  
Insourcing operations, either through Somerset Council or city, town and parish councils, contributes to economic stability by managing costs effectively. It supports the development of a skilled workforce and local opportunities, aligning with the council's goal of promoting a stable and flourishing economy.
16. Financially, analysis has shown that a full insourcing of services currently provided by IDVerde would generate an annual saving to the Council of between £200k and £300k. This saving will be significantly higher if devolution is achieved within key towns.

## **Financial and Risk Implications**

17. In the MTFP for 2024/25 this proposal was included as a proposed saving. A full insourcing programme would generate an estimated annual saving of between £200k and £300k. This is detailed below. More details can be found in the attached business case.

However, it should be noted that this has been done for the purpose of ensuring that in a worse case scenario, and all devolution processes failed or were not agreed before the expiration of the contracts, that the Council could deliver services itself within the existing financial envelope.

Savings are made by the rationalising of the contract delivery team, and the ability to delivery additional works within the workforce. These are currently chargeable as non-core elements of the contracts.

### Summary

<b>Current Budget Provision</b>	<b>£</b>
West Somerset Street Cleansing	1,192,000
Mendip Groundcare (inc trees & play areas)	546,500
Mendip Street Cleansing	871,000
Mendip Public Toilets	149,100
SWT Public Toilets	120,600
National Living Wage Uplift	143,500
Mendip Additional Tree Works Budget	60,000
Mendip Fees & Hired Charges Budget	25,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,107,700</b>
<b>Additional Costs</b>	
Contract Manager (40% of role)	21,846
Contract Supervisor	37,832
Contract Supervisor (50% of role)	18,916
Contract Supervisor (29.6 hours per week)	30,265
Mendip Flytip Additional Works	31,000
Other miscellaneous repairs	7,000
EzyTree Software License	6,170
Annual contractual GM87 uplift	66,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>219,030</b>
<b>Total Contract Cost</b>	<b>3,326,730</b>
<b>Estimated In House Provision Cost</b>	

Street Cleansing Mendip	654,873
Street Cleansing West Somerset	1,340,712
Open Spaces Mendip	579,838
Trees Mendip	96,764
Play Areas Mendip	80,058
Public Toilets Mendip	126,536
Public Toilets SWT	129,536
<b>TOTAL</b>	3,008,317
<b>+/- of in house provision</b>	-318,412
<b>Contingency</b>	80,000
<b>Total Estimated Saving 25/26</b>	-238,412

18. The following risks exist within this proposal:

<b>Contract Extension Trigger in West Somerset and Taunton.</b>					
<p>The IDV contract in SWT expires on 30/11/2024 for West Somerset and 31/1/2025 for Taunton. There is an automatic three year extension built into the contract if performance during the contract has been acceptable. It is likely this will be triggered, which restricts devolution and insourcing options.</p> <p>From a cost perspective, the in sourcing estimate is comparable to the existing contract price on this element, so an extension would not impact the Council's existing budgets. However, it does potentially hamper devolution.</p> <p>These are short timescales, so any extension does also act as a mitigation for service continuation in this area.</p>					
<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Please enter mitigation here</b>					
<p>Early discussions with IDVerde around devolution have taken place, and IDVerde are open to potential devolution in some areas of this contract. If successful, this would deliver a saving for the Council.</p>					

<b>Unsuccessful Devolution to City, town and parish councils.</b>					
<p>Should the Council be unable to agree devolution with city, town and parish councils, then it would be left to deliver the service itself.</p>					
<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Please enter mitigation here</b>					

If the Council were deliver all services under the contracts itself from the expiration date, analysis by officers suggests that this could be done in house, with an estimated annual saving of £200k - £300k achieved.

Further mitigation has been provided by early engagement with the key city and town councils impacted by this proposal, namely Taunton, Wellington, Minehead, Wells, Shepton Mallett, Glastonbury, Street and Frome. Early indications is that all towns are very keen on devolution of grounds maintenance services in particular.

**Only partial devolution achieved**

Should the Council only achieve partial devolution either geographically or by service, then it would be left to deliver remaining services itself.

<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>10</b>
-------------------	----------	---------------	----------	-------------------	-----------

**Please enter mitigation here**

If the Council were to deliver all services under the contracts itself from the expiration date, analysis by officers suggests that this could be done in house, with an estimated annual saving of £200k - £300k achieved. Therefore there is sufficient budget for the Council to still deliver some services if only partial devolution was achieved.

**Cost**

It should be noted that outsourcing can often result in cost savings, as external providers may achieve economies of scale or have specialized equipment and expertise. The costings exercise does suggest that in some areas the current outsourced arrangements are cheaper.

<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>6</b>
-------------------	----------	---------------	----------	-------------------	----------

**Please enter mitigation here**

Devolution aside, wider savings would be achieved from the removal of Somerset Council staff overseeing the contract delivery, and the flexibility to be able to undertake additional, non-core contract work internally rather than relying on the contractor for this.

**TUPE of IDVerde staff into the Council**

With any insourcing, there would likely be a requirement for Somerset Council to transfer in some current IDV staff as part of TUPE regulations, although the breadth of this isn't clear yet. HR advice will be sought in due course.

Where devolution was involved, the city, town or parish council would be subject to the TUPE obligations, not Somerset Council.

<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>10</b>
-------------------	----------	---------------	----------	-------------------	-----------

**Please enter mitigation here**

Early engagement with HR Advisory.

**Contractual obligations - potential need to negotiation early exit.**

If the contracts reaches their natural expiration date then there are no contractual obligations with the outsourced provider, including termination fees or penalties for early contract termination. However, if there was a need to negotiate these terms early this could add complexity to the devolution and insourcing process.

<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>8</b>
-------------------	----------	---------------	----------	-------------------	----------

**Please enter mitigation here**

An early review of contract exit terms has been undertaken by Commercial Services. Elements of the existing arrangement, such as TUPE and vehicle leases may require negotiation and agreement. This will require further support from other areas of the authority, such as Procurement and Commercial, Human Resources and Fleet.

**Temporary Impact on Service Delivery**

As IDVerde run the contract down, there will likely be additional workload in managing the contract, once notice has been given to the provider. There is a risk that IDV may begin to move staff elsewhere and not provide as much resource to the contract. This may result in a reduced level of standards.

There may also be teething issues with the start up of the new in house arrangements as teams get up and running. Effective recruitment, induction, training and procurement is also vital to ensure all teams have everything they need to be able to work effectively from the first day.

However, it should also be noted that IDVerde have been very supportive of the devolution agenda, and are committed to working with the Council to achieve it's aims. IDVerde have been involved with successful devolution programmes elsewhere and have shared some useful learnings with officers.

<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>6</b>
-------------------	----------	---------------	----------	-------------------	----------

**Please enter mitigation here**



A full implementation plan will be delivered upon approval from Exec to insource and devolve the service.

### **Legal Implications**

19. As per previous risk, if the contract reaches its natural expiration date then there are no contractual obligations with the outsourced provider, including termination fees or penalties for early contract termination. However, if there was a need to negotiate these terms early this could add complexity to the insourcing process.

### **HR Implications**

20. With any insourcing, there would likely be a requirement for Somerset Council to transfer in some current IDV staff as part of TUPE regulations, although the breadth of this isn't clear yet. HR advice will be sought in due course.

Where devolution was involved, the city, town or parish council would be subject to the TUPE obligations, not Somerset Council.

There are also potential impacts on a number of contract delivery roles within the former Mendip area.

### **Other Implications:**

### **Equalities Implications**

21. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed and is attached to this report.

### **Community Safety Implications**

22. Direct, in sourced services do have greater flexibility to react to minor crime such as graffiti and vandalism. If damage is repaired quicker, this can have a positive impact upon quality of life and wellbeing.

City, town and parish councils are also often better placed to be part of dealing with local issues in their open spaces and town centres.

## **Climate Change and Sustainability Implications**

23. A smaller estate as a result of evolving open spaces to city, town and parish councils could lessen Somerset Council's wider impact on nature recovery. There would be less control over key urban sites, and consistency on nature friendly grassland management and tree planting and maintenance would be reduced. However, the Council's Climate Emergency Strategy, Tree Strategy and Local Nature Recovery Strategy identify city, town and parish councils as key partners in the delivery of these agendas, so it is hoped that this will be overcome.

## **Health and Safety Implications**

24. There are no health and safety implications associated with this report.

## **Health and Wellbeing Implications**

25. There are no significant negative impacts on health and wellbeing associated with this report.

The positive impact that open spaces and a clean street scene environment has on health and wellbeing is widely recognised. It is the view of officers that devolution and/or insourcing of these services would improve the quality of service delivery, and therefore would have a positive impact on health and wellbeing.

## **Social Value**

26. There is no procurement process associated with this proposal, but it is acknowledged that devolution to city, town and parish councils can bring a feeling of local communities being closer to their open spaces and in turn this can play a role in helping build community capacity and improving health wellbeing.

## **Scrutiny comments / recommendations:**

27. N/A

## **Background**

28. The Council's Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance services sit within the Regulatory and Operational Services directorate, and covers the following functions:

- Street Cleansing (road and street sweeping, bin emptying, cleaning and servicing of public toilets).
- Parks and Open Spaces (grounds maintenance of Council owned cemeteries, parks and open spaces; play area maintenance and inspections and tree maintenance and inspections).

Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance were responsibilities of the former district councils. The services were performed via a mix of in house and outsourced provision across the county. These arrangements transitioned into the new unitary authority and are still in place within the old district boundaries.

<b>Former District</b>	<b>Groundcare</b>	<b>Street Cleansing</b>
Somerset West and Taunton (SWT)	In house	Outsourced
Mendip (MDC)	Outsourced	Outsourced
South Somerset (SSDC)	In house	In house
Sedgemoor (SDC)	In house	In house

29. Both outsourced arrangements at SWT and MDC are managed through separate contracts with the same supplier, IDVerde (IDV). The SWT contract is a legacy contract prior to the merger of the former Taunton Deane Borough Council (TDBC) and West Somerset District Council (WSDC), and therefore has two expiry dates: 30/11/2024 for West Somerset and 31/1/2025 for Taunton.

The current outsourced arrangement within the former MDC area delivers the following on a day to day basis:

- Grounds maintenance on Council owned cemeteries, parks and open spaces in Frome, Shepton Mallet, Glastonbury, Street, Wells, Baltonborough, West Pennard, Butleigh, Croscombe, Pilton, Cranmore, North Wootton, St Cuthbert Out, Wookey, Westbury Sub-Mendip, Stoke St Michael, Leigh-on-Mendip, Coleford, Kilmersdon, Holcombe, Mells, Elm, Hemington, Norton St Phillip, Rode, Beckington, Telisford, Trudoxhill, Witham Friary, Nunney, Wanstrow, Whatley, Ashwick, Chilcompton, Litton,

Evercreech, Ditchheat.

The current specification in the contract stipulates that grass is cut to a minimum height of 25mm. The total square metreage 680 square metres per grass cut.

- Tree inspections and tree maintenance work on all trees in the former MDC area. This is circa 4,000 trees.
  - Playground inspections and maintenance on all play areas in the former MDC area. There are currently 37 council-owned play areas maintained as part of the core contract.
  - Street sweeping throughout the former MDC area.
  - Emptying of bins throughout the former MDC area (approximately 400).
  - Removal of flytips throughout the former MDC area.
  - Cleaning of 5 public toilets in MDC area.
30. The current outsourced arrangement within the former SWT area currently delivers the following on a day to day basis:
- Street sweeping throughout the former SWT area.
  - Emptying of circa 75% of council-owned bins in the old SWT area.
  - Removal of flytips throughout the former SWT area.
  - Cleaning of 8 public toilets in former SWT area.
31. In Summer 2023, a project team was established to understand whether the Council could in source the outsourced elements of the service upon expiration of the contract. This followed a formal review by the Commercial Services team during the LGR programme, which highlighted that savings could be made by insourcing, particularly in the old Mendip area.
32. The project team undertook a full cost analysis of outsourced areas and returned a view that the Council could save between £200k and £300k per annum by insourcing. The project team also identified a number of additional benefits, including direct control and accountability, flexibility in delivery, better local knowledge and community engagement and an improved service quality.

The business case for complete insourcing is attached as an appendix to this document, and includes a financial breakdown of the projected savings.

33. However, the group also highlighted that the wider aspiration should be devolution of services to city, town and parish councils at the expiration of the contract, with the Council insourcing what remains. This would deliver the biggest financial saving for the Council, and support the Council's emerging devolution agenda.
34. This is particularly relevant in the old MDC area, where Shepton Mallet Town Council (SMTC), Frome Town Council (FTC), Glastonbury Town Council (GTC) and Wells City Council (WCC) have all expressed a desire to take on services. A continued outsourced arrangement will mean that savings through devolution in those areas will be much harder to achieve.
35. The early indications from city and town councils is that the main interest is in parks and open spaces, grounds maintenance and public toilets. If devolution was successful in these services, then Somerset Council would need to insource street cleansing. The attached business case demonstrates that this could be done at a financial saving within the Mendip area.

The 3 year extension clause would be triggered in Taunton and West Somerset, so Somerset Council would need to continue the outsourced arrangement. However, this contract is street scene only and the sense from town and parish councils is that they are not minded to take on street cleansing services. This is the one element of the combined contracts where an in sourcing saving is not predicted, so an extension would give time to review this arrangement in more detail to achieve this at a later date.

36. It is also worth noting that Street Cleansing is a statutory service. Somerset Council is the accountable authority and would remain so even if the service was devolved.

## **Background Papers**

37. Initial business case for insourcing of IDVerde contract.

## **Appendices**


None

## **Assurance checklist**

	Officer Name	Date Completed
Legal & Governance Implications	David Clark	9.02.2024
Communications	Peter Elliott	9.2.2024
Finance & Procurement	Nicola Hix	27.02.24
Workforce	Sari Brice	23.2.2024
Asset Management	Oliver Woodhams	8.2.2024
Executive Director / Senior Manager	Sarah Dowden	31.1.2024
Strategy & Performance	Alyn Jones	
Executive Lead Member	Cllr Federica Smith-Roberts	31.1.2024
<b>Consulted:</b>	Councillor Name	
Local Division Members	All	27.02.2024 agenda publication
Opposition Spokesperson		
Scrutiny Chair	Cllr Gwil Wren	14.2.2024

## Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Before completing this EIA please ensure you have read the EIA guidance notes – available from your Equality Officer or [www.somerset.gov.uk/impactassessment](http://www.somerset.gov.uk/impactassessment)

<b>Organisation prepared for (mark as appropriate)</b>						
<b>Version</b>		<b>Date Completed</b>				
<b>Description of what is being impact assessed</b>						
<p>Insourcing of IDVerde services in West and East. This includes street cleansing, open spaces, play areas and cleaning of public toilets in East, and street cleansing and cleaning of public toilets in the West and will be provided by the Council's in-house team. Please note this EIA does need to be read in part with the EIA for the closure of public toilets as there will be an impact if the decision is taken to close all public toilets or if some of them are devolved to town and parish councils.</p>						
<b>Evidence</b>						
<p><b>What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?</b> Sources such as the <a href="#">Office of National Statistics</a>, <a href="#">Somerset Intelligence Partnership</a>, <a href="#">Somerset's Joint Strategic Needs Analysis (JSNA)</a>, Staff and/or <a href="#">area profiles</a>, should be detailed here</p>						
<p>Access to good open space and a clean-living environment is important for all. This proposal does not suggest reducing opportunities, it suggests managing the areas in house rather than using an external provided.</p> <p>There is no data available on how different groups use our open spaces or public realm although everyone is welcome to use the spaces available to them across Somerset.</p>						
<b>Staffing</b>						

The county has 2 IDverde contracts covering the former Mendip area and the former Somerset West and Taunton area. The council is looking to devolve services to town and parish councils as part of the devolution framework and the services currently provided under each contract will inevitably be part of the devolution of services to town and parish councils. A further review of the EIA will be undertaken when it is clear what services will be devolved and what potential implications this could have.

**Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups and what have they told you?** If you have not consulted other people, please explain why?

No consultation has been undertaken.

### Analysis of impact on protected groups

The Public Sector Equality Duty requires us to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations with protected groups. Consider how this policy/service will achieve these aims. In the table below, using the evidence outlined above and your own understanding, detail what considerations and potential impacts against each of the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty. Based on this information, make an assessment of the likely outcome, before you have implemented any mitigation.

Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
<b>Age</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Disability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



<b>Gender reassignment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□
<b>Race and ethnicity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□
<b>Religion or belief</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□
<b>Sex</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□

<b>Armed Forces (including serving personnel, families and veterans)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□
<b>Other, e.g. carers, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No group is disproportionately impacted as the service will remain but undertaken by an inhouse team</li> </ul>	□	⊗	□

**Negative outcomes action plan**  
 Where you have ascertained that there will potentially be negative outcomes, you are required to mitigate the impact of these. Please detail below the actions that you intend to take.

Action taken/to be taken	Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
	Select date			□

**If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.**

There are no negative impacts identified

<b>Completed by:</b>	<b>Jonathan Stevens</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>20/11/2023</b>
<b>Signed off by:</b>	<b>Sarah Dowden</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>22.11.2023</b>

<b>Equality Lead sign off name:</b>	<b>Angela Farmer</b>
<b>Equality Lead sign off date:</b>	<b>5/1/24</b>
<b>To be reviewed by:</b> (officer name)	
<b>Review date:</b>	