



NOTICE OF MEETING

EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 14 JANUARY 2021 AT 1.00 PM

VIRTUAL REMOTE MEETING

Telephone enquiries to Vicki Plytas 02392 834058
Email: vicki.plytas@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

Membership

Councillor Ben Dowling (Chair)
Councillor Donna Jones (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Matthew Atkins
Councillor Cal Corkery
Councillor Darren Sanders
Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson CBE

Standing Deputies

Councillor Simon Boshier
Councillor Lynne Stagg
Councillor Luke Stubbs
Councillor Matthew Winnington
Councillor Hugh Mason

(NB This agenda should be retained for future reference with the Minutes of this meeting.)
Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: www.portsmouth.gov.uk

Deputations

A written deputation stating to which agenda decision item it refers must be received by the officer named at the top of the agenda **by 12 noon two working days preceding the meeting**. Any written deputation received by email will be sent to the Members on the relevant decision making body and be referred to and read out at the meeting within permitted time limits.

AGENDA

1 Apologies for Absence

2 **Declarations of Members' Interests**

3 **Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2020 (Pages 5 - 10)**

RECOMMENDED that the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2020 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4 **Living Wage (Pages 11 - 40)**

(The report that was originally marked "to follow" was published on the website on 11 January 2021.)

Purpose

At Employment Committee (EC) on 22nd September 2020, Members requested further clarification on the financial impact of becoming an accredited Living Wage employer (previously known as an accredited Foundation Living Wage employer). Members wanted to understand in particular the financial impact the council would incur from its contractors

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with the estimated financial impact to enable an informed decision as to the next steps. It will also inform Members of the Real Living Wage (RLW) rate increase from 1st April 2021, (to £9.50 per hour) and to advise members of the financial impact on its pay bill.

Additionally, the report sets out the progress made by the working group in researching and understanding the requirements, challenges and risks associated with adopting the Foundation Living Wage and how they may be overcome or mitigated.

RECOMMENDED that

Members' instructions are sought as to which of the following recommendations to adopt, noting that recommendations i) and iii) are mutually exclusive:

- i) Members agree to endorse the application of Living Wage accreditation status and seek approval from:**
 - a. Full Council as part of the Annual Budget and Council Tax setting meeting, including the identification of a further £3.2m of General Fund Budget Savings covering the period 2021/22 to 2023/24**
 - b. The Cabinet Member for Housing as part of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget and Rent Setting meeting, including the identification of a further £0.9m of HRA Budget Savings covering the period 2021/22 to 2023/24 (noting that ordinarily such matters would be discussed through consultation with the housing tenants representatives)**

- ii) Members agree that at this current time they wish to continue**

to pay all Council employees the Living Wage rate, noting that the cost of this is provided for within existing budgets

- iii) Members instruct Officers to work with the Living Wage Foundation to seek to attain Living Wage accreditation through the development of an implementation plan over a suitable period that is consistent with the Council's overall financial constraints and also accommodates any likely legal / procurement challenges; any such plan to be approved by Full Council with any financial impact commencing in 2021/22**

This meeting is webcast (videoed), viewable via the Council's livestream account at <https://livestream.com/accounts/14063785>

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Employment Committee held on Tuesday, 24 November 2020 at 2.00 pm as a Virtual Remote Meeting

(NB These minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the meeting which can be found at www.portsmouth.gov.uk.)

Present

Councillor Ben Dowling (in the chair)

Councillor Cal Corkery

Councillor Darren Sanders

Councillor Luke Stubbs

Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson CBE

Officers Present

David Williams Chief Executive

Natasha Edmunds, Director Corporate Services

Rochelle Kneller, Assistant Director HR

Shaun Tetley, Payroll and Pensions Manager

Sue Page, Finance Manager

Liz Walder, IT Category Manager, Procurement

18. Apologies for Absence (AI 1)

The Chair, Councillor Ben Dowling, welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that it was being held virtually because of restrictions imposed following the outbreak of Covid 19.

He agreed to vary the order of the agenda to hear item 6 first. (For ease of reference the item will remain in its original place in the minutes.)

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Donna Jones. Councillor Luke Stubbs deputised for her.

19. Declarations of Members' Interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of Members' interests

20. Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 September 2020 (AI 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2020 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

21. Sickness Absence - Quarterly Report (AI 4)

(TAKE IN REPORT)

Rochelle Kneller introduced the report which updates the Employment Committee about the levels of sickness absence across the council and the actions being taken to manage absence and promote employee wellbeing.

Section 3.2 shows this quarter's sickness absence figures as compared with the last quarter (September 2020). Most directorates have reported a decline in sickness absence levels this quarter.

Appendix 1 shows absence levels by directorate for the period from November 2019 to November 2020.

Appendix 2 provides a summary of reasons for sickness absence for the last year.

Section 4 of the report provides information about the success of the Council's work on wellbeing - in particular that the Council's wellbeing champion programme has recently been recognised by the Local government Association (LGA). The LGA's lead on mental health and wellbeing of the adult social care workforce was informed of PCC's work in supporting our staff and as a result has compiled a case study which is now live on their dedicated webpage on the topic.

Members were advised that the Council is now signed up and registered as a Hidden Disabilities Scheme and that staff training will be rolled out across the Council.

During discussion

- A query was raised about a comparison of the tables not showing an expected increase in the numbers of those off sick with cold-like symptoms (in view of the Covid pandemic.) It was explained that this was because Covid related sickness was recorded separately and self-isolation was not being recorded as sickness absence.
- In response to a query concerning recording work related stress, it was confirmed that this had not been recorded as a separate category for a complete year as yet so comparisons could not be drawn.

Members asked that their appreciation for the hard work done by all those involved in the wellbeing champion programme and their thanks to all Council employees who had worked so hard during the pandemic to look after people across the City, be formally recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED that Members

- (1) Continue to monitor sickness absence and ensure appropriate management action is taken to address absenteeism**
- (2) Noted the wellbeing activities undertaken to support attendance**
- (3) Noted the additional wellbeing activities specifically in response to the Covid-19 pandemic.**
- (4) Noted the reduction in absence levels across the organisation**

22. Reward and Recognition (AI 5)

(TAKE IN REPORT)

Rochelle Kneller introduced the report which has been updated since the last meeting to include what the Council had already done, what existing mechanisms were in place for recognising employees' resilience and hard

work during the on-going pandemic period (Appendix 2) and to outline options for what could be put into place in the future.

Sections 4.4 and 4.5 of the report set out monetary and non-monetary reward and recognition.

Members were advised that honoraria payments were not appropriate for council wide staff recognition.

Since the last meeting, the leave situation across all employees in the Council had been collated and this showed that awarding an additional day's leave to everyone would be feasible if Members agreed to this as suitable reward and recognition. The recommendation is that the additional day would either be Christmas Eve or New Year's Eve.

During discussion

- Officers said they considered that following a difficult year, employees would notice and appreciate being given an extra day's leave even though sandwich days had been given as leave in recent years.
- Members were advised that Appendix 2 contained details of how other authorities were rewarding their staff.
- Reference was made to additional information from other authorities having been received since the report had been published and this would be circulated to Committee members after the meeting and would be attached to the minutes.
- Members agreed that the pandemic had adversely affected the economy but did not unanimously agree about whether a pay freeze for public sector workers was an appropriate response.

A discussion took place about which day the additional leave would be given but as a national announcement was expected imminently from central government about the relaxation of restrictions for a 5 day period over Christmas,

it was

proposed by Councillor Vernon-Jackson

seconded by Councillor Ben Dowling

that the Chief Executive be given delegated power to make that decision once the national announcement had been made and to adopt all other recommendations in the report.

This was agreed by assent.

RESOLVED that Members

- (1) Noted how PCC has already publicly acknowledged the outstanding services and efforts that council officers have made and are continuing to make during the ongoing pandemic. Future email communication from the Leader and the Chief Executive to staff thanking them for their efforts is continued.**
- (2) Noted what reward and recognition systems are already in place across the whole City Council as contained within Appendix 2.**
- (3) Confirmed the reward and recognition in relation to efforts made as a result of the pandemic through the arrangement of**

an awards ceremony when it is safe to do so, or any other method of reward that Members wish to implement.

- (4) Agreed to provide an additional day's annual leave to all staff to be taken on either Christmas Eve or New Year's Eve as decided by the Chief Executive once the expected national announcement about relaxing Covid 19 restrictions over the Christmas period had been made (or at a later date for those rota'd to work on these days) in recognition of the efforts of all staff during the pandemic.

23. Living Wage Accreditation Update (AI 6)

(TAKE IN REPORT - information only)

The Chair agreed to vary the order of the agenda to hear this item first. (For ease of reference the item will remain in its original place in the minutes.)

Natasha Edmunds introduced the report which updated the Committee on progress. Since the last meeting in September, a working group had been established consisting of representatives from Procurement, Finance, HR, Market Research and Legal.

A survey had been devised and sent out to all relevant contractors with a closing date of 4 December 2020 and reminders are being sent to ensure the best possible response rate.

A meeting has also been arranged with the Real Living Wage organisation to be attended by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Central Services as well as Rochelle Kneller and Natasha Edmunds.

In response to questions

- It was confirmed that trades unions have not been involved in the working group so far but there will be opportunities for engagement with unions going forward
- It was explained that the knowledge gap in the terms and conditions of employees working in organisations outside PCC that have contracts with us is largely because they are considered to be confidential. PCC does try to understand working practices and employment terms and conditions of organisations it works with.
- If suppliers do not reply to the survey by the deadline, the consequence would be that the financial analysis would be based on a greater number of assumptions than would be ideal - but the work would not be held up.
- Liz Walder, IT Category Manager, Procurement, advised that it was not possible within the rules relating to procurement to stipulate that certain employment conditions are in place before a contract is awarded to an organisation. It is possible to make requests but not to mandate. This can still be problematic even after an organisation becomes accredited. PCC is seeking to learn from other authorities' experience in this regard. The City Solicitor confirmed that PCC does not have a legal right to insist its contractors pay the Real Living Wage.
- One Member viewed seeking to pay the Real Living Wage in the current economic climate as unrealistic.

The Chair thanked officers for the report and the item was noted.

The meeting concluded at 2.44 pm.

Councillor Ben Dowling
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4



Title of meeting: Employment Committee
Date of meeting: 14th January 2021
Subject: Living Wage Accredited Employer
Report by: Director of Finance & Resources
Wards affected:
Key decision: Yes/No
Full Council decision: Yes/No

1. Purpose of report

At Employment Committee (EC) on 22nd September 2020, Members requested further clarification on the financial impact of becoming an accredited Living Wage employer (previously known as an accredited Foundation Living Wage employer). Members wanted to understand in particular the financial impact the council would incur from its contractors

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with the estimated financial impact to enable an informed decision as to the next steps. It will also inform Members of the Real Living Wage (RLW) rate increase from 1st April 2021, (to £9.50 per hour) and to advise members of the financial impact on its pay bill.

Additionally, the report sets out the progress made by the working group in researching and understanding the requirements, challenges and risks associated with adopting the Foundation Living Wage and how they may be overcome or mitigated.

2. Recommendations

Members' instructions are sought as to which of the following recommendations to adopt, noting that recommendations i) and iii) are mutually exclusive:

- i) Members agree to endorse the application of Living Wage accreditation status and seek approval from:
 - a. Full Council as part of the Annual Budget and Council Tax setting meeting, including the identification of a further £3.2m of General Fund Budget Savings covering the period 2021/22 to 2023/24
 - b. The Cabinet Member for Housing as part of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget and Rent Setting meeting, including the identification of a further £0.9m of HRA Budget Savings covering the period 2021/22 to 2023/24 (noting

that ordinarily such matters would be discussed through consultation with the housing tenants representatives)

- ii) Members agree that at this current time they wish to continue to pay all Council employees the Living Wage rate, noting that the cost of this is provided for within existing budgets
- iii) Members instruct Officers to work with the Living Wage Foundation to seek to attain Living Wage accreditation through the development of an implementation plan over a suitable period that is consistent with the Council's overall financial constraints and also accommodates any likely legal / procurement challenges; any such plan to be approved by Full Council with any financial impact commencing in 2021/22

3. Background

At present Portsmouth City Council (PCC) is not an accredited living wage employer but follows the principals of the Living Wage Foundation. PCC currently pays the Real Living Wage (RLW) rate at £9.30 to all its employees including those who transferred to the council under TUPE and Local Authority maintained schools.

The RLW rate is set by the Living Wage Foundation and rises each April, it is due to rise in April 2021 to £9.50. This rate continues to sit above the National Living Wage for 23 year olds set by the government which in comparison, will rise to £8.91 in April 2021.

Whether to apply each increase of the Real Living Wage rate is reviewed annually by EC. At EC on 6th March 2020, Members approved the 2020 RLW increase and also asked for the Council to explore becoming an accredited Living Wage Employer. On 17th March 2020, the Council was placed into emergency protocol due to the global pandemic.

At EC on the 22nd September 2020, Members were presented with detail on the timeline and work required to become an accredited Living Wage Employer (this was informed through discussion with The Living Wage Foundation). Members were made aware that as part of the criteria for the council to become accredited, the council would need to require its contractors to pay the RLW to its staff who worked on behalf of PCC for 2 hours or more a week for 8 consecutive weeks. Due to the pandemic it was not possible to undertake a detailed piece of work to provide members with indicative additional costs across all contracts. However, the report did estimate that the uplift in cost for Residential and Domiciliary Care would amount to circa. £2m per annum. Adult Social Care is currently forecasting an overall Budget Deficit of circa £4.3m for 2021/22, this could be offset by a 3% Adult Social Care precept amounting to £2.5m should Full Council approve this at its upcoming Annual Council Tax Setting meeting. Nevertheless, a shortfall remains and a further £2m additional cost for Adult Social Care is unaffordable at this time.

Following discussions with other local authorities and The Living Wage Foundation, Members were also made aware that to quantify the likely cost, a detailed review of over

650 contracts would need to be undertaken which could include writing to contractors and sub-contractors to determine the extent to which adopting the RLW would lead to a pass through of costs.

On 24th November 2020, a report for noting was presented to EC Members informing them that a working party had been set up and that a meeting with a representative from the Living Wage Foundation was to take place early December 2020.

Members were also appraised of the work carried out by the working group to date. This work included Finance and Procurement working through all the contracts to identify and remove any contracts that are for items such as supplies or utilities as these do not fall within the remit of this piece of work.

Finance and Procurement identified which services within PCC were likely to be more highly impacted should PCC apply for accredited status, they focussed on getting responses from these contractors first to allow for a more reasonable set of financial assumptions to be made. They also worked with Contract Managers within these services to gain an understanding of the likely impact on services.

A survey was sent out the week beginning 16th November and ran until 4th December 2020. On the 24th November 2020, Members were advised that in the first week numbers were extremely low and that the working party had sent out a further communication to those that had not participated.

Whilst it is acknowledged that Members should be made aware of the financial implications to the council by becoming an accredited Living Wage employer. It is also recognised Members would need to be aware of the challenges of implementation. The council approached another local authority who had achieved accreditation in 2013 to understand their biggest challenges which were identified as follows:

- Getting schools on-board, this continues to remain a challenge year on year.
- The requirement for the yearly increase to be signed off annually by their Members and senior officers
- Impact on the pay line, as the Living Wage rate increases beyond that of the NJC increases. This has resulted in some of their SCP's in their pay scale being of the same value. Therefore, this led to them deleting some SCP's in their lower pay bands. For example Band 1 previously had three SCP's now has one due to higher increases being applied to the Living Wage rate

Following on from this discussion a piece of work was undertaken to understand what challenges other Local Authorities faced. This work was undertaken by reading committee reports and Living Wage literature. A summary of these challenges identified through this research can be found in appendix 1.

On the 10th December 2020, Members and officers met with a representative from the Living Wage Foundation to discuss the process required to become an accredited living wage employer.

4. Impact of School Decision

Members are reminded of the need for consultation with individual schools, as it is for each individual school's governing body to decide whether or not to adopt the consolidated RLW rate for their employees.

Schools have been contacted to ask for their initial thoughts on the implementation of the real living wage. Those that responded voiced that in principle they support the premise of the real living wage but their concerns were the impact on their budget in the coming years. Some schools stated that they would in principle be able to support the 2021 rise but would have to review future rises, due to budgets. A couple of schools replied that their current financial budget position would not allow for them to support the implementation of the real living wage.

Any school that chooses not to implement the RLW, will need to work with Payroll to create their own pay scale. This would then create different pay scales within the Council and could cause equal pay issues.

5. Survey and Results

Procurement and Finance identified 198 high impact contracts for PCC to survey. The final response rate was 11% (22 contractors) of those that did respond 4 did not meet the criteria (i.e. would not have been impacted by a requirement to adopt the RLW). The limited survey information and targeted engagement with contract managers in the high impact areas who have considerable experience within their services has been used to inform the assumptions applied to modelling the financial impact on contract payments set out in para. 6.5

6. Financial Impact

Financial impact of decisions already taken

Members are to note the estimated cost to the council of continuing to pay council staff the RLW and becoming an accredited Living Wage employer, is summarised as follows, all of which have been provided for within the Council's Budget:

Cost Area	Cost -Year 1	Cost - Year 2	Full Year Cost - (Yr 3)
Council Employee Uplift	£45,300	£45,300	£45,300
Council School Employee Uplift	£15,400	£15,400	£15,400
Kickstart Scheme Uplift - 1 year only	£128,000	-	-
Total	£188,700	£60,700	£60,700

Financial Implications of decisions to be made

The estimated cost over the next 3 years and thereafter of becoming a fully accredited Living Wage employer is set out below:

Cost Area	Cost Year 1	Cost Year 2	Full Year cost (Yr 3)
Accreditation Annual Fee	£480	£480	£480
Contract Uplift -General Fund	£1,058,000	£2,116,000	£3,174,000
- HRA	£300,000	£600,000	£900,000
- Schools	£26,000	£52,000	£78,000
Project implementation	£52,000		
Total	£1,436,480	£2,768,480	£4,152,480

The cost in all areas can be explained in the following paragraphs.

6.1. Cost of Accreditation Annual Fee

Accreditation by the Living Wage Foundation is at an annual cost of £480 plus VAT for public sector organisations with 250 or more employees, including third party.

6.2. Cost of Council Employee Uplift

At previous EC's Members have agreed to apply the RLW to the council's pay scales, where the council's hourly rate falls below the rate regardless of accreditation status. Each year EC Members are provided with the cost of implementing the rise. The increase for 2021/2022 is detailed below:

On 25th November 2020, the Government announced that there would be a public sector (excluding NHS) pay freeze. With the exception of public sector workers earning less than £24,000, who would see an increase by at least £250 per annum. This increase would apply to anyone on band 6, SCP 11 or below.

Despite this increase from the government, those on band 1, SCP 1 would continue to fall under the RLW as at 1st April 2020.

There will be approximately 48 employees (excluding schools) whose hourly rate will fall below £9.50. Of the 48, 22 are TUPE employees, 16 are apprentices

The impact of the RLW increase financially is approximately £45,300 per annum (including on costs).

6.3. Cost of School Employees Uplift

Since 2018, all schools have adopted to pay the RLW rate in-line with the council. Many schools have stated that in principle they will continue to follow the Council's lead if, the

Council agrees to implement the 2021/22 RLW rate. However, Members should be aware that there are schools who have stated that this is not financially viable.

There will be approximately 298 LA maintained school employees whose hourly rate will fall below £9.50.

If all LA maintained schools were to implement the RLW, the total cost to the schools would be £15,400 per annum (including on-cost).

6.4. Cost of Kickstart Scheme Uplift

The Kickstart Scheme provides funding to create new job placements for 16 to 24 year olds on Universal Credit who are at risk of long term unemployment. Employers of all sizes can apply for funding which covers:

- 100% of the National Minimum Wage (or the National Living Wage depending on the age of the participant) for 25 hours per week for a total of 6 months
- associated employer National Insurance contributions
- employer minimum automatic enrolment contributions
- Employers can spread the start date of the job placements up until the end of December 2021.

A Kickstart Scheme application must be for a minimum of 30 job placements. It has been agreed that although the scheme requires individuals to be paid the national minimum/living wage, the Council will pay them the Real Living Wage rate.

The impact of the RLW increase financially is estimated at £128,500 per annum (including on costs) for a mixed cohort of 50 placements in the 18-20 and 21-24 age groups. It should be noted that if the cohort are all under 21, the annual cost rises to £225,000 per annum. The cost of this proposal will be met from the Cabinet Portfolio Reserve.

6.5. Cost of Contract Uplift

The full year impact of requiring PCC contractors to pay the FLW is estimated at £4.2m with a potential lower and upper range of £3m and £5.5m respectively. It should be noted that the full impact would not be felt until Year 3 as contracts are re-tendered or renewed over this period.

The estimated financial impact of £4.1m can be further analysed as £3.2m on the General Fund, £0.9m on HRA and £78k on schools. In terms of the General Fund impact, the majority of this (£2.6m) relates to Care services. There is no provision for these costs within services existing revenue budgets.

It should be noted that the year by year figures stated within the table above are based upon straight line profiling across 3 years to mirror the 3 year implementation which the Council would be required to work to. Further work will be required to establish a contract by contract implementation programme which will take account of contract expiry, extension and review

dates. On this basis the actual cumulative cost increases will not follow a simple straight line but are envisaged to still rise to the estimated 3 year total stated within the table.

6.6. Project Implementation and Management

Under the steer of Members, the work of the group so far has focussed on engagement with the Living Wage Foundation and understanding any challenges to accreditation (i.e. Procurement, Legal and Financial) through the review of the toolkit for accreditation, engagement with other accredited Local Authorities and other available research.

Some of the key challenges identified and which the working group are seeking to overcome /mitigate are:

Human Resources

- Getting all LA maintained schools on-board and limiting potential equal pay risks
- The impact of future Living wage increases on PCC's pay scale.

Procurement

- Adopting LW requirements as a stated pass/fail requirement - This has been identified as a clear breach of EU law as an "unlawful barrier to entry". The LW suggest this is low risk due to there being no record of challenges in the courts. There may still be domestic law challenges to consider in mandating LW. Other authorities have attempted to overcome this through different routes although the same objections may still arise. Alternatively, a dilution of the requirements to overcome some risks may not ensure compliance and could also lead to significant inconsistencies in supplier treatment.
- Whilst the LW may be open to a level of discretion where best endeavours are evidenced with a commitment to progress, there is a clear direction that all relevant contracts should be LW compliant within 3 years of accreditation being granted either through re-tender, incorporation at extension break point or for longer term contracts mid-term negotiation.
- Extension option negotiations - Suppliers could opt to not take up the extension due to LW requirements either due to inability to agree a price uplift or 2 tier workforce issues where they also have contracts with other customers who are not mandating LW. This could mean that implementation is delayed or the contract will have to be put out to re-tender earlier than anticipated which may stretch internal resources.
- Re-tenders and tenders for new requirements - an LW mandate may make the Council less attractive to bidders due to two tier workforce issues and other complexities.

- Similarly for long term contracts it may also be difficult and legally unenforceable to make suppliers adopt LW as this will require formal contract variation which could be rejected. Implementation could be delayed on this basis or the contract could be terminated to allow for re-tender which could come at significant cost and risk to the Council (operationally and financially for strategic contracts). The Council would seek a pragmatic accommodation with the LW in such circumstances.
- Supplier Base - Adopting the LW would make the Council more attractive as potential business partner to more socially minded firms who have already incorporated LW. However, in the short term at least, it is likely to narrow rather than expand the Council's potential supplier base. Mandating LW either explicitly or implicitly could be challenged by suppliers as an unlawful barrier to entry.
- Contract Management - Breach of contract by suppliers where LW is incorporated could not be enforced through a lawful termination. Careful design, implementation and monitoring would be required but with any contract penalties being softer such as barring from future opportunities, not granting extensions, financial deductions, etc.
- Resourcing generally - Incorporating LW requirements within procurement documentation, governance processes, contract terms and contract monitoring processes. This will require up front work to complete and agree drafting which will then require a level of training to officers involved in procurement and contract management.

Financial

- General affordability and the potential to phase any additional cost over time - the current LW tool kit implies this is 3 years
- Specifically, the additional cost to Adult Social Care which is recognised by the Living Wage Foundation "that there is no simple or cost-free fix" and is "the hardest category of contractor to crack"

It is proposed that the Council further engages with the Living Wage Foundation and other accredited local authorities to inform how full accreditation might be achieved given the identified challenges and the considerable work that is required. The following plan is proposed:

- Continue the work of the working party and expand the representatives to include officers from Comms, Trade Union and other identified internal stakeholders.
- Create a dedicated lead project officer post (subject to job evaluation this will be at an estimated cost of up to £52k, for one year initially). This project officer will work with the Living Wage Foundation to prepare an implementation plan that

accommodates the council's overall fiscal limits (in effect this means implementation would start in April 2022, at the earliest).

- Recruit to vacant Contract Management Business Partner Post - Band 10/11. Whilst not primarily driven by Procurement / Contract Management, implementation and ongoing monitoring will be heavily reliant on these functions. There is currently a vacant Band 10 / 11 Contract Management Business Partner role within Procurement which is already budgeted for within the current Procurement budget. This is in addition to the Project Officer post above but will not come at any additional cost.
- Through research into the challenges (appendix 1) that other authorities have faced, input would also be required from service areas affected, particularly social care and schools, which is likely to require service specific working groups to be set up alongside the main working group.

7. Reasons for recommendations

Members requested further clarification on the financial impact of becoming an accredited Living Wage employer (previously known as an accredited Foundation Living Wage employer). Members wanted to understand in particular the financial impact the council would incur from its contractors. This paper provides Members the financial impact of accreditation as well as the challenges that need to be considered and the work so far on how that may be addressed. A range of options as to how to progress is proposed.

8. Integrated impact assessment

Appendix 2

9. Legal implications

Within the context of PCC's own employment base, the cost is limited. The difficulty is to align the proposed LW accreditation to external contractors.

Dealing first with the PCC employment base the cost is limited and the risk of a potential equal pay claim or some claim based upon discrimination is remote as the actual rate of inclusion will continue to increase thereby diminishing the risk of wage disparity.

There are risks in an operational sense with respect to bandings which will potentially cause problems with regard to equality and the ability of managers to direct their staff in that the higher the banding the more that is expected from the colleague being undermined by the reality that a person is paid the same for what the employer says is a differently banded job. Whilst not illegal (absent an equal pay claim) it is of itself a problem in the sense of simple leadership and motivation - inevitably there will be salary creep and less engagement from higher banded colleagues paid the same as lower banded colleagues.

Secondly, the difficulty with regard to contractors is that current contracts cannot, absent agreement, be varied to impose an obligation upon a third party contractor to align its own employee terms and conditions.

New contractors will either not want to contract or more likely not want to tender as they will not want a work force that is paid higher than their own terms and conditions imposed by PCC the contracting party (it is to be remembered that the contractor and their own staff have agreed their own contractual nexus that on the face of it is not something that PCC can interfere with). The corollary is that if, as a primary term PCC insists upon LW alignment then the differential cost will be added on, additionally it would be easy to ascribe a greater primary total overall cost to a contract than just higher salary cost so in essence in allowing the pay cost to be added to the PCC direct cost of the contract such a position would potentially encourage contractors to inflate the true overall project cost.

Whilst this is not of itself illegal it is probably contrary to the concept of obtaining best value and in a procurement sense a problem in that the contracting pool may well diminish as contractors simply say that they are priced out of the job and do not tender- that might lead to a tangible challenge in that theoretically it might be challengeable to argue that a reasonable LA would not seek to align to a standard that places a direct cost upon the LA, will have a budgetary affect and a direct service impact upon delivery all set as against a limited/ diminishing contractor base.

10. Director of Finance's comments

The potential full financial impact to PCC of LW accreditation is set out in para 6. With a full year cost to the General Fund expected to be £3.2m and a full year cost to the HRA of £0.9m.

Neither of these additional costs have been factored into the financial planning assumptions for the General Fund or the HRA which require the Council to make savings in 2021/22 of £1m and £1.3, respectively. Furthermore the Council is facing further unanticipated Budget Pressures, which in the main relate to the ongoing impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and which include reductions in Council Tax income, Business Rate income, Property related income and Ferry Port income but exacerbated by additional costs associated with increases of Children in Need cases and increased costs / demand for Domiciliary Care, Residential Care and Nursing Care. It is highly likely that the additional funding provided by Government for next year to cover the continuing impact of Covid 19 will be insufficient to meet these losses and costs. Any ongoing financial impact from Covid 19 will need to be factored into future years' savings requirements for the Council.

Should recommendation i) be approved, the City Council will need to approve further General Fund savings (over and above the planned £1m savings) of £3.2m over the next three years in order to fund this policy initiative. Similarly, the Cabinet Member for Housing will need to incorporate an additional cost of £0.9m into the Housing Revenue Account Budget over the next 3 years to be met by increasing Housing Rents and / or reductions in spending and be considered as part of the consultation process with council housing tenants.

Given that any approval by Full Council / Cabinet Member for Housing, commits the organisation to future spending commitments, the corresponding savings will also need to be approved covering each of the three years 2021/22 through to 2023/24.

.....
Signed by:

Appendices:

- Appendix 1 - Living Wage Challenges
- Appendix 2 - Integrated impact assessment

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

.....
Signed by:

This page is intentionally left blank

CHALLENGE	SOLUTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS
<p data-bbox="192 236 367 261">Procurement</p> <p data-bbox="192 272 1055 336">Enforcing payment of the Living Wage to contracted and subcontracted staff.</p> <ul data-bbox="248 384 1099 847" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="248 384 1099 520">• The Oxford City Council Living Wage Review Group found 'that the Council has no mechanism for verifying employers' responses to the request within procurements that they pay the 'Oxford Living Wage'. <li data-bbox="248 528 1099 695">• 'Under procurement law it is not possible to include payment of the Oxford Living Wage as a qualifying criterion, or to judge tenders on that basis because it is unlawful (or at least unenforceable) for one legal entity to seek to dictate the terms and conditions under which another legal entity employs its staff. ' <li data-bbox="248 703 1099 847">• The Review Group also noted that the Council could theoretically treat non-payment of the 'Oxford Living Wage' by a contractor as a breach of contract, but whether this would be legally enforceable is untested and there is no British case law in this area. 	<ul data-bbox="1178 272 2036 1398" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1178 272 2036 376">• It is important to publicise and promote our status as a Living Wage Employer. By making this well-known. Staff working on contracts should be aware of the wage they should be receiving. <li data-bbox="1178 384 2036 520">• Work with contractors to review rates of pay for relevant contracted staff. Identify where contractors are not meeting Living Wage requirements. Help them calculate the financial implications of bringing contracted staff up to the Living Wage. <li data-bbox="1178 528 2036 592">• Specify, educate and raise awareness with suppliers on the benefits and brand value that the real Living Wage generates <li data-bbox="1178 600 2036 735">• The Council could include in its advice to businesses when selling to the Council, a statement about the Council being an accredited living wage employer and the benefits of paying the Living Wage in terms of best value, wellbeing and quality. <li data-bbox="1178 743 2036 919">• The council could launch an Ethical Code of Conduct for Suppliers, (ECCS), detailing a commitment to pay the real Living Wage. This could be included in all tenders issued by the Council and embedded in to contract management to hold suppliers to account. (Sheffield County Council) <li data-bbox="1178 927 2036 1062">• Clauses could be inserted into tenders/contracts requesting that contractors ensure that the Living Wage is paid to all employees (and the employees of their suppliers) aged over 18 when providing the goods and services. <li data-bbox="1178 1070 2036 1174">• Ultimately if a supplier was found to be in breach of a living wage clause the Council could decide not to renew the contract, which should provide some incentive for suppliers to comply. <li data-bbox="1178 1182 2036 1246">• Incentivise employers to pay living wages – e.g. by increasing orders to those suppliers. (Ethical Trading Initiative) <li data-bbox="1178 1254 2036 1318">• Use innovative approaches for implementing the living wage in procurement, including applying the Social Value Act <li data-bbox="1178 1326 2036 1398">• EU procurement law was a barrier to awarding a new contract on the basis of paying a living wage and this was overcome in a

number of innovative ways by different local authorities. Some negotiated each contract on an individual basis, carefully assessing each one, and highlighting early that it was something in which the council was interested (eg, Islington). Another approach was to include two pricing schedules for the tenderer to complete, one which included paying all staff the living wage and one without (eg, Lewisham). The Mayor of Lewisham, having adopted this approach, has consistently chosen to implement the living wage option. A third approach was to apply the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012, which requires local authorities to consider how what is being procured might improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the local area, when entering into procurement contracts. Local authorities must also consider how this improvement can be secured while acting proportionately and ensuring action is relevant. Paying the living wage might be viewed as improving the social and economic well-being of an area and so is likely to be a relevant consideration under the Act, where it is relevant to the contract and action is proportionate. (Health Inequalities and the Living Wage).

- The Council maintains a watching brief on the legal position (including any emerging case law) relating to public bodies requiring contractors to pay their staff a living wage, with a view to strengthening the obligations on the Council's own suppliers and their subcontractors, should the opportunity to do so arise in future.
- Setting up a public service model of employer commitment for partners/contractors to see. The Living Wage Employer Experience: Cardiff University 2017
- Use existing or create new partnerships to develop wider support for the living wage
- Introduce an Employment and Enterprise Scheme to develop a programme where local small businesses are supported to give young people one year job opportunities or apprenticeships that

	<p>are paid at the Living Wage. Businesses receive a subsidy to help pay the Living Wage, as well as being offered mentoring and support to help their business grow. (Southwark's London Living Wage Symposium)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align local skills provision with the productivity agenda: Local authorities have a growing role in ensuring that further and higher education provision is linked to employer needs and demand. In particular local authorities have the opportunity to influence skills provision towards higher skill, higher pay career outcomes and to support relationships between skills providers and employers to drive workforce upskilling, in support of a locally led agenda on higher productivity and pay. (Southwark's London Living Wage Symposium) • Join up pay campaigns with other local cost of living issues, including housing (Southwark's London Living Wage Symposium) • Norwich City Council offer to give a relief on business rates to organisations that become accredited. The amount of relief granted will be equal to the accreditation fee the organisation has paid (up to £3000). If the fee is more than the annual charge for that year the relief will be equal to the annual charge.
<p>Procurement: Monitoring compliance of contractors</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any system may have to be based on self-certification by suppliers, with workers through their unions reporting non-compliance. • There are benefits to businesses in 'badging' the fact that they pay the Real Living Wage because hopefully consumers will make positive purchasing decisions based on this knowledge. • Oxford Living Wage Review suggested 'a targeted approach' as being the best way to encourage take up of the 'Oxford Living Wage' in the short term. They stated that 'The top 100 employers in the city employ almost 70,000 workers, which represents over half of all jobs in the city, so encouraging these employers to pay a living wage is likely to make the most difference in tackling low pay

	<p>in the city. Of these employers, the ones whose operations are largely focused on Oxford, rather than across the UK or beyond, are likely to have the most flexibility to implement a local wage policy. Similarly, employers that currently pay marginally below a living wage may also be more inclined adopt a living wage policy as the cost to them will be relatively modest.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council can also speak directly to employers and seek to influence them through business partnerships, gauging take up of the Living Wage by direct contact and discussion. • Set up a 'Progressive Procurement' Group of key Partners including colleges, universities, NHS/CCG with a key agenda to increase the real Living Wage across its considerable combined supply chain. (Sheffield County Council) • The Oxford Review Group suggested that another good way to engage with businesses would be to hold an annual forum event promoting the benefits to employers of paying a living: 'That the Council hosts an annual Oxford Living Wage seminar or symposium, which could involve local employers, trade unions, campaigners, universities, faith leaders and the Living Wage Foundation, to monitor progress and promote the case for the Oxford Living Wage and encourage employers to sign up to that or the Real Living Wage.'
<p>Other Areas to Consider</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging the wider community • Consolidating work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with faith groups and trade unions to develop strong partnerships across society to strengthen this work. Support from faith groups, anti-poverty groups and social justice campaigners are important. • Promoting union recognition with local employers is also important. • The Council could create, maintain and promote a list of local employers paying the Living Wage and make this list available on

	<p>the Council website, and newsletter, as well as linking to the Living Wage Foundation’s map of employers paying the Real Living Wage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council could make it very clear that in most circumstances grants etc. will only be awarded to organisations paying their employed staff no less than the Living Wage, and contacts other local public sector commissioners urging them to do likewise. (Oxford City Council). • Designated Officer: That the Council allocates responsibility to a designated officer to support and oversee the promotion of the Real Living Wage (as in Oxford City Council). • This should include a suite of ‘business as usual’ activities, as well as specific campaigns, for example around a Living Wage Week • Set targets for the promotion of the living wage and a system of monitoring overseen by the Designated Officer to measure take up and progress of a) The number of accredited living wage employers based in the city (e.g. doubling the current number within 2 years). b) The number of local employers paying the Living Wage. Information on the take up of the Living Wage by employers in Portsmouth is made available by the Living Wage Foundation.
<p>Adult Social Care</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most common impact on employment was the consequences for pay differentials which can have negative consequences on the recruitment and retention of team leaders/supervisors, with existing workers reluctant to take on greater responsibility for limited additional rewards. 	<p>'Implementing the Scottish Living Wage in Adult Social Care' suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater consultation between providers and local authorities. • Engagement of all partners in meaningful discussions re developing a template that recognises the true costs of providing satisfactory levels of care. • Obtain the support of sector bodies • Having a distribution formulae that takes account of the degree to which services in local authority areas are outsourced as well as issues such as geography, deprivation and need. • According of greater weighting to workforce matters in procurement guidance • Commissioning of further research into improvements in employee take-home pay /living standards as a result of the LW,

	<p>consequences of handing back contracts and the balance between the cost and quality in the award of contracts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 'The Effects on Minimum Wage Policy on the Long term Care Sector in England' briefing has highlighted the need to focus on a broader set of improvements in social care – including a more outcomes-based commissioning approach, integration with health services, investment in innovative technologies, and the necessity of raising pay beyond legal minimum levels and providing opportunities for training and progression – if the sector and workforce are to be put on a sustainable footing to meet the needs of our ageing population in the longer term.' (Resolution Foundation November 2015)
--	---

References:

Promoting the Oxford Living Wage: Report of the Oxford Living Wage Review Group: Oxford City Council March 2018

<https://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk/documents/s41002/Report%20of%20the%20Oxford%20Living%20Wage%20Review%20Group%20v1.0%20for%20Scrutiny%20Committee.pdf>

Local Action Towards a Living Wage: A Report on Southwark's London Living Wage Symposium

<https://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk/documents/s41002/Report%20of%20the%20Oxford%20Living%20Wage%20Review%20Group%20v1.0%20for%20Scrutiny%20Committee.pdf>

Hampshire County Council Decision Report: Options for Applying the Living Wage

<file:///C:/Users/per921/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/INetCache/Content.Outlook/35B6L2LZ/EHCC%20Committee%20-%20Living%20Wage%2012.3.2014.pdf>

Norwich City Council: National Non-Domestic Rates Living Wage Rate Relief Policy

file:///C:/Users/per921/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/INetCache/Content.Outlook/35B6L2LZ/National_Living_Wage_Relief_Policy.pdf

Ethical Trading Initiative: <https://www.ethicaltrade.org/issues/living-wage-workers>

Implementing the Living Wage in UK Local Government: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/ER-02-2017-0039/full/html>

Public Health England: Health Inequalities and the Living Wage file:///C:/Users/per921/Downloads/Living_wage_health_inequalities.pdf

The Living Wage Employer Experience: Cardiff University 2017

https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/722429/The-Living-Wage-Employer-Experience-Report.pdf



Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Integrated impact assessment (IIA) form December 2019

www.portsmouth.gov.uk

The integrated impact assessment is a quick and easy screening process. It should:

- identify those policies, projects, services, functions or strategies that could impact positively or negatively on the following areas:
 - Communities and safety
 - Regeneration and culture
 - Environment and public space
 - Equality & - Diversity This can be found in Section A5

Directorate:

Corporate Services

Service, function:

Human Resources

Title of policy, service, function, project or strategy (new or old) :

Becoming an accredited Living Wage Employer

Type of policy, service, function, project or strategy:

- Existing
- New / proposed
- Changed

What is the aim of your policy, service, function, project or strategy?

The aim of this policy is for Portsmouth City Council (PCC) to become an accredited Living Wage employer. This is an extension of PCC's current policy to pay all its employees a minimum equivalent to the Real Living Wage rate set by the Living Wage Foundation. This currently stands at £9.30 due to

increase to £9.50 as at 1st April 2021.

Has any consultation been undertaken for this proposal? What were the outcomes of the consultations? Has anything changed because of the consultation? Did this inform your proposal?

No

A - Communities and safety	Yes	No
-----------------------------------	------------	-----------

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

A1-Crime - Will it make our city safer?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce crime, disorder, ASB and the fear of crime?
- How will it prevent the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances?
- How will it protect and support young people at risk of harm?
- How will it discourage re-offending?

If you want more information contact Lisa.Wills@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-spp-plan-2018-20.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How will you measure/check the impact of your proposal?

A - Communities and safety	Yes	No
-----------------------------------	------------	-----------

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

A2-Housing - Will it provide good quality homes?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it increase good quality affordable housing, including social housing?
- How will it reduce the number of poor quality homes and accommodation?
- How will it produce well-insulated and sustainable buildings?
- How will it provide a mix of housing for different groups and needs?

If you want more information contact Daniel.Young@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/psh-providing-affordable-housing-in-portsmouth-april-19.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

A - Communities and safety

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

A3-Health - Will this help promote healthy, safe and independent living?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it improve physical and mental health?
- How will it improve quality of life?
- How will it encourage healthy lifestyle choices?
- How will it create healthy places? (Including workplaces)

If you want more information contact Dominique.Letouze@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cons-114.86-health-and-wellbeing-strategy-proof-2.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

A - Communities and safety

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

A4-Income deprivation and poverty-Will it consider income deprivation and reduce poverty?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it support those vulnerable to falling into poverty; e.g., single working age adults and lone parent households?
- How will it consider low-income communities, households and individuals?
- How will it support those unable to work?
- How will it support those with no educational qualifications?

If you want more information contact Mark.Sage@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-homelessness-strategy-2018-to-2023.pdf>
<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/health-and-care/health/joint-strategic-needs-assessment>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

A - Communities and safety

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

A5-Equality & diversity - Will it have any positive/negative impacts on the protected characteristics?



In thinking about this question:

- How will it impact on the protected characteristics-Positive or negative impact (Protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, Age, disability, race/ethnicity, Sexual orientation, gender reassignment, sex, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership,socio-economic)
- What mitigation has been put in place to lessen any impacts or barriers removed?
- How will it help promote equality for a specific protected characteristic?

If you want more information contact gina.perryman@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cmu-equality-strategy-2019-22-final.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

The implementation of Living Wage will impact more females than males due to the fact that the postholders of the roles affected are predominantly women approximately 91% (365) and 9% (38) men

Therefore, implementation of the Living Wage will promote equality for women.

Updated February 2019: The increase to the PCC Living Wage rate for TUPE employees with predominately positively affect more women then men. Approximately 92% (14) of postholders are women who and 18% (3) are men.

Updated February 2020: The increase to the PCC Living Wage rate for TUPE employees and Employees on SCP 1 and 2 with predominately positively affect more women then men. Approximately 94.21% (309) of post holders are women who and 5.79% (19) are men.

Updated January 2021: The increase to the PCC Living Wage rate for TUPE employees and Employees on SCP 1 and apprentices predominately positively affect more women then men. Approximately 92% (318) of post holders are women who and 8% (28) are men.

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

Page 34

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

B1-Carbon emissions - Will it reduce carbon emissions?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions?
- How will it provide renewable sources of energy?
- How will it reduce the need for motorised vehicle travel?
- How will it encourage and support residents to reduce carbon emissions?

If you want more information contact Tristan.thorn@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cmu-sustainability-strategy.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

B2-Energy use - Will it reduce energy use?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce water consumption?
- How will it reduce electricity consumption?
- How will it reduce gas consumption?
- How will it reduce the production of waste?

If you want more information contact Triston.thorn@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/pln-portsmouth-plan-post-adoption.pdf>

<https://democracy.portsmouth.gov.uk/documents/s24685/Home%20Energy%20Appendix%201%20-%20Energy%20and%20water%20at%20home%20-%20Strategy%202019-25.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

B3 - Climate change mitigation and flooding-Will it proactively mitigate against a changing climate and flooding?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it minimise flood risk from both coastal and surface flooding in the future?
- How will it protect properties and buildings from flooding?
- How will it make local people aware of the risk from flooding?
- How will it mitigate for future changes in temperature and extreme weather events?

If you want more information contact Tristan.thorn@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/env-surface-water-management-plan-2019.pdf>

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-flood-risk-management-plan.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

B4-Natural environment-Will it ensure public spaces are greener, more sustainable and well-maintained?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it encourage biodiversity and protect habitats?
- How will it preserve natural sites?
- How will it conserve and enhance natural species?

If you want more information contact Daniel.Young@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/pln-solent-recreation-mitigation-strategy-dec-17.pdf>

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/pln-portsmouth-plan-post-adoption.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

B5-Air quality - Will it improve air quality?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce motor vehicle traffic congestion?
- How will it reduce emissions of key pollutants?
- How will it discourage the idling of motor vehicles?
- How will it reduce reliance on private car use?

If you want more information contact Hayley.Trower@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/env-aq-air-quality-plan-outline-business-case.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

B6-Transport - Will it improve road safety and transport for the whole community?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it prioritise pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users over users of private vehicles?
- How will it allocate street space to ensure children and older people can walk and cycle safely in the area?
- How will it increase the proportion of journeys made using sustainable and active transport?
- How will it reduce the risk of traffic collisions, and near misses, with pedestrians and cyclists?

If you want more information contact Pam.Turton@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/travel/local-transport-plan-3>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

B7-Waste management - Will it increase recycling and reduce the production of waste?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce household waste and consumption?
- How will it increase recycling?
- How will it reduce industrial and construction waste?

If you want more information contact Steven.Russell@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/HampshireMineralsWastePlanADOPTED.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

C - Regeneration of our city

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

C1-Culture and heritage - Will it promote, protect and enhance our culture and heritage?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it protect areas of cultural value?
- How will it protect listed buildings?
- How will it encourage events and attractions?
- How will it make Portsmouth a city people want to live in?

If you want more information contact Claire.Looney@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/pln-portsmouth-plan-post-adoption.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

C - Regeneration of our city

Yes

No

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

C2-Employment and opportunities - Will it promote the development of a skilled workforce?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it improve qualifications and skills for local people?
- How will it reduce unemployment?
- How will it create high quality jobs?
- How will it improve earnings?

If you want more information contact Mark.Pembleton@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-regeneration-strategy.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

Page 39

Is your policy/proposal relevant to the following questions?

C3 - Economy - Will it encourage businesses to invest in the city, support sustainable growth and regeneration?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it encourage the development of key industries?
- How will it improve the local economy?
- How will it create valuable employment opportunities for local people?
- How will it promote employment and growth in the city?

If you want more information contact Mark.Pembleton@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-regeneration-strategy.pdf>

Please expand on the impact your policy/proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

Q8 - Who was involved in the Integrated impact assessment?

Gemma Bulloch

This IIA has been approved by:

Contact number:

Date: