

# EIA001095 Youth Service Estate Review

## About your EIA

Reference Number:	EIA001095
Subject of EIA:	Youth Service Estate Review
Description:	<p>The Youth Service Estate Review proposal is to not close any Youth Centres and involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retaining some of the Youth Service's existing buildings in Council ownership;</li> <li>• Transferring some of the Youth Service's existing buildings to third party providers who will take over the Council's Youth Service provision at these sites, i.e. there will not be a change of use of the buildings;</li> <li>• Taking further steps to identify options for one building which has been identified as being operationally surplus to requirements.</li> </ul> <p>• Clifton Road Youth Centre- Sutton Coldfield, Naseby Youth Centre - Hodge Hill, Maypole Youth Centre - Selly Oak and Lozells Recreation Group -Perry Barr, be reported as surplus through Cabinet Committee (Property) in order to consider their suitability either through for disposal to enable revenue savings to be realised or transfer to a third party youth service provider, subject to viability and best consideration requirements being satisfied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain four properties: Shard End Youth Centre - Hodge Hill, The Factory – Northfield, The Lighthouse – Ladywood and Concord Youth Centre – Hall Green for direct delivery by the Youth Service.</li> </ul> <p>Background 1.1 The Children and Families (C&amp;F) directorate commissioned a detailed service review of the Youth Service management and staff structure and youth estate. 1.2 The review provided evidence-based recommendations produced in collaboration with the Corporate Landlord team relating to which operational assets are suitable and should be retained for direct delivery of youth services by the council. It also identified those youth centres for which the recommendation is that there is no longer a direct delivery requirement. 1.3 The review also provided recommendations around surplus property assets that albeit no longer required by the service could be managed and operated to provide youth service provision but run by a different provider than the council. The Youth Service is working with Corporate Landlord to identify options in this respect and to ensure consistency with other service transformation activity where there is a direct impact on the internal requirements for corporate accommodation and a synergy with the asset disposal programme. 1.4 The Youth Service remodelling took into account a savings target of £2.3m for the Young People's Services area and the budget set forward for the Youth Service aligned to a rationalised and more efficient operational footprint will make £1.178m available for staffing and £225,000 available for the continued operation of Youth Centres in corporately owned buildings. The service review that informed these recommendations gathered information on maintenance &amp; running costs, levels of need, range of locality services supporting young people in each area and views of the youth provision from young people, communities and elected members to inform recommendations. 1.5 During the review, which commenced in April 2024, and the formal consultation period from October 2024 to 17th January 2025, staff &amp; young people contributed to shaping the operational delivery model and service provision. 1.6 The service also invited third party organisations, via Birmingham Voluntary Service Council, that are interested to work in partnership with the youth service to complete Expressions of Interest in respect of taking on responsibility for youth provision and potentially associated Youth Centres. These have been assessed and due to the strong response from viable organisations supported the decision to progress with a recommendation. 1.7 The recommendation is to deliver services through a blended model of BCC retained centres and</p>

	<p>voluntary sector community run centres. This provides the ability to continue operating within centres generating income within budget and supporting organisations to work in partnership with BCC. This allows centres to remain open and meets the needs of the community and young people and preventing issues escalating. 1.8 This preferred option of a blended model allows the Youth Service to retain four youth centres for direct delivery - Shard End Youth Centre - Hodge Hill, The Factory – Northfield, The Lighthouse – Ladywood and Concord Youth Centre – Hall Green and four centres to be managed and maintained by VCS organisations - Clifton Road Youth Centre- Sutton Coldfield, Naseby Youth Centre - Hodge Hill, Maypole Youth Centre - Selly Oak and Lozells Recreation Group - Perry Barr and one - The Vibe - Yardley by internal transfers to the Youth Offending Service as existing service providers and one - Oakland Youth Centre - Perry Barr to Education as on a school site. 1.9 Two others will form part of local and the Well Being centre review. Two are already managed under long term leases on 20+ years. Subject to due diligence this recommendation has been supported by elected members through informal 1.10 Cabinet &amp; member engagement sessions, local community feedback and signed off by the cross-Directorate Service Accommodation Board, 4th February 2025, so where viable vital youth services can continue to be delivered to meet the needs of young people and prevent escalation to complex care services.</p>
In support of:	["Amended service"]
Reviewing Frequency:	Every two years
First review date:	13/06/2027

## Directorate, Division & Service Area

Directorates:	["Children and Families"]
Division:	Children and Young People
Service Area:	Youth Service

## Budget Savings

Related to budget savings?:	
Budget proposal reference number:	

## Officers

Responsible Officer Email:	rita.chohan@birmingham.gov.uk
Accountable Officer Email:	sue.m.harrison@birmingham.gov.uk

## Data Sources

Data sources:	["Consultation results", "Interviews", "Birmingham City Observatory data and insight", "Surveys", IMD] Young People Redesign Review - Youth Service
---------------	---

Data sources Details:	Consultation, questionnaires to young people, deprivation statistics, levels of need <a href="https://birminghamcitycouncil.sharepoint.com/:p:/r/sites/YPSRedesign-Implementation-Documents/Shared%20Documents/P1%20P2%20Newton%20Impact%20Documents/1%20-%20Phase%201/Published%20Reports/Young%20People%27s%20Services%20Redesign%20-%20Final%20Report%20-%20Youth.pptx?d=wc05ff695d9c446989a54d68a30b2e4c5&amp;csf=1&amp;web=1&amp;e=LxHid5">https://birminghamcitycouncil.sharepoint.com/:p:/r/sites/YPSRedesign-Implementation-Documents/Shared%20Documents/P1%20P2%20Newton%20Impact%20Documents/1%20-%20Phase%201/Published%20Reports/Young%20People%27s%20Services%20Redesign%20-%20Final%20Report%20-%20Youth.pptx?d=wc05ff695d9c446989a54d68a30b2e4c5&amp;csf=1&amp;web=1&amp;e=LxHid5</a>
-----------------------	---

## Initial Assessment

Impact Age:	Yes
Impact Disability:	Yes
Impact Sex:	No
Impact Gender Reassignment:	No
Impact Marriage and Civil Partnerships:	No
Impact Pregnancy and Maternity:	No
Impact Race:	Yes
Impact Religion or Beliefs:	No
Impact Sexual Orientation:	No
Impact Care Experience:	

## Initial Assessment Summary

Initial Assessment Summary:	The initial assessment showed a strong indication that there would be minimal impacts on people. We will carry out a full EIA to ensure mitigation against any impacts.
Is a full EIA Required?:	Yes

## Protected Characteristic – Age

Impact Age:	
Age Group Impacted:	12-19+
Age Impact Details:	Relationships with BCC youth workers and young people may be affected on those centres to be managed by the VCS as sessions led by BCC will reduce as services are transitioned. The majority of young people accessing youth services in the centres are ages 14-16 years old with Clifton Road and Oakland Youth Centre attracting older young people of 15+ and The Vibe 13-17 year old. Future centre management should have experience of working with this age group to meet need. During the course of our engagement, we spoke to 1500 children and young people across Birmingham's schools and colleges to understand their needs and priorities. From 1427 citywide responses received to the "Your Priorities" survey Education was consistently the highest priority for Birmingham's young people, across all age groups and most district areas. 91% of those surveyed felt positively about the support they were

	<p>received. There was generally low awareness of how to access support in the event of specific mental health and sexual health difficulties. Interacting and building connections with others was slightly more important for those aged 10 to 14, while those aged 15 to 19 were slightly more likely to prioritise safety and education. 150 young people engaged in conversation on five college campuses. Skills and training was also a key priority, especially in more deprived areas of the city and among younger people. It was the area where young people had the most clarity over how to get support, but there was still some dissatisfaction. Although there was some variation between districts and age groups, most demographics were more similar than they were different in their opinions, suggesting opportunities for citywide interventions. 1700+ data points from ONS and IMD geographical data showed Safety was a major priority for young people, especially in the inner city and among those aged 15 to 18, although some districts (notably Yardley) exhibited clear strengths in this area. There were significant opportunities for cross-district working, with general satisfaction with services being higher in the less deprived districts. These were all factored into the new operating model. The management of the centres to VCS organisations will mean that BCC will no longer control the centres. Mitigation plans should reflect selection criteria of future service providers and monitoring to ensure providers are maintaining buildings and able to cover running costs.</p>
Age Impact Mitigation:	<p>Youth workers will continue to deliver services albeit on a reduced basis to support the VCS organisations to transition and continue to support young people so there is no breakdown of support. This will continue throughout the lifecycle of the lease held by the VCS. The YS will deliver two sessions per centre. Youth workers have also been involved in transition plans which involve communication plans with young people as services transfer to VCS organisations. The service invited third party organisations, via Birmingham Voluntary Service Council, that are interested to work in partnership with the youth service to complete Expressions of Interest in respect of taking on responsibility for youth provision and potentially associated Youth Centres. These have been assessed against set criteria of financial viability, operational experience, track record of working with the council and document evidence such as insurance. Due to the strong response from viable organisations supported the decision to progress with a recommendation for further due diligence in respect of four centres potentially delivering services through partnership arrangements and Corporate Landlord are advising on the implications of this option and associated leasing/transfer mechanisms. The delivery of youth work and the continuation of BCC Youth workers providing support in each centre will be written into lease agreements. VCS organisations that have been shortlisted are either long standing, local to each centre or have been delivering youth services so are familiar with service users and the community and will not disrupt relationships that have been built. They also have a strong viable financial track record and are skilled at attracting funding through bid applications. They are well supported by local elected members as part of the selection criteria included feedback from ward members on the viability and track record of shortlisted organisations. The award process involves interviews with each organisation where dialogue will cover costs and commitment that will be required in taking on management of a centre. The centres that are in scope to transfer to VCS are Clifton Road Youth Centre- Sutton Coldfield, Naseby Youth Centre - Hodge Hill, Maypole Youth Centre - Selly Oak and Lozells Recreation Group -Perry Barr. The majority of young people that attend are 14-16 with Clifton Road attracting 15+. The Youth service will ensure the VCS organisations are experienced in supporting these age groups. The young people survey highlighted that Interacting and building connections with others was slightly more important for those aged 10 to 14, while those aged 15 to 19 were slightly more likely to prioritise safety and education. Therefore services need to be reflective of this.</p>

## Protected Characteristic – Disability

Impact Disability:	In the four areas where centres are to be transferred to VCS organisations there may be an impact on young people with disabilities.
Disability Impact Details:	There may be a breakdown in relationships and lack of understanding of needs by area. Need was measured against the Indices of Deprivation (IMD-Sub domain) - Income, Employment, Education Skills and Training, Health deprivation and Disabilities, Crime, Barriers to Housing & Services and Living Environment. This would inform what factors support services can focus on by district and influence building partnerships to support delivery on a district basis. Health & Disabilities needs scored higher in Northfields, Sutton

	Coldfield and Edgbaston and below average in all other districts. Clifton Road is the only centre that will be considered for VCS management therefore BCC youth workers will ensure these needs are met through a transition plan that includes a communication plan with young people.
Disability Impact Mitigation:	There is a focus on the Senior Social Workers in each district to build partnerships to provide targeted support . This will be monitored and measured through performance management and support provided to ensure the appropriate services support need. Parent and carer groups also provide intelligence on service gaps to meet need and the VCS have a network that can attract funding to meet specific need. There currently isn't a breakdown regarding the range of disabilities of service users, but youth services are in the process of gathering details and building dashboards to monitor performance, which can be analysed in the future to inform the proposal, and the EIA can be updated to reflect this if more data is obtained. Disability data has not been broken done into sub categories, but the Youth Service are currently working with the Data & Insights team to develop dashboards to inform management reports that can assist in capturing performance across all categories.

## Protected Characteristic – Sex

Impact Sex:	This may impact citizens based on their sex
Sex Groups Impacted:	Male/ female
Sex Impact Details:	Measures have shown that males in the majority of sites could be impacted on. Males are the highest of users in all centres in the region of 53-70% with females attendance 10-13% apart from Shard End and The Factory. Therefore, there would be the potential for more negative outcomes for males as the larger number of attendees, if support was not available. Both of these centres will be retained by the Youth Service.
Sex Impact Mitigation:	Focus would be to continue to provide support for all attendees and where there are service gaps, build relationships with VCS organisations and plan which programmes could be developed in partnership with Youth Services. Service gaps may arise if the attendance balance shifts and VCS organisations are well placed to bid for funding that can target specific groups. This was highlighted in egagement session feedback. The vision of Children and Families services is to plan and deliver services on a district level so gaps in services could be delivered across multiple services to ensure needs are met. There are already examples of good practice that can be rolled out such as employment sessions for young people being delivered in libraries and youth work in Family Hubs. This approach could ensure services are delivered to both sexes in a variety of locations that they feel comfortable in.

## Protected Characteristic – Gender Reassignment

Impact Gender Reassignment:	
Gender Reassignment Impact Details:	
Gender Reassignment Impact Mitigation:	

## Protected Characteristic – Marriage and Civil Partnership

Impact Marriage and Civil Partnership:	
--	--

Marriage and Civil Partnership Groups Impacted:	
Marriage and Civil Partnership Impact Details:	
Marriage and Civil Partnership Impact Mitigation:	

## Protected Characteristic – Pregnancy and Maternity

Impact Pregnancy and Maternity:	
Pregnancy and Maternity Impact Details:	
Pregnancy and Maternity Impact Mitigation:	

## Protected Characteristic – Ethnicity and Race

Impact Ethnicity and Race:	It may be likely that ethnic young people may be affected due their race.
Ethnicity and Race Groups Impacted:	Due to Birmingham's diversity composition that were gathered were split into White, Asian, Black, Mixed & Other. There is a spread of ethnicity across all centres so all would be impacted.
Ethnicity and Race Impact Details:	The ethnic breakdown by centre did vary. Clifton Road, Shard End and Maypole were mainly attended by White YP, Naseby, Concord, Oakland, Lozells, The Lighthouse were mainly Asian and Black YP, The Vibe were mainly Asian and White YP. Clifton Road Youth Centre- Sutton Coldfield, Naseby Youth Centre - Hodge Hill, Maypole Youth Centre - Selly Oak and Lozells Recreation Group -Perry Barr are the centres to be considered for VCS transfer. Services and staff should be reflective and response to needs. Being aware of culture and race needs and tailoring support to meet these needs.
Ethnicity and Race Impact Mitigation:	Service delivery already takes into account the race profile of service users and tailors service delivery to meet their need. Potential VCS organisations scoring and interview process will also support the lease award to ensure organisations have the skills and experience to continue to meet need. The shortlisted organisations are local to each area so have a good track record and understanding of need. Some have a good working knowledge and relationships with BCC youth work staff, young people, parents, elected members and partner organisations. This will ensure the transition is smooth and seamless as far as relationships are concerned. Activities are geared up to meet the varying needs and appropriate language support and services reflect this. The potential VCS organisations will be vetted to ensure this continues.

## Protected Characteristic – Religion

Impact Religion:	
Religion Groups Impacted:	
Religion Impact Details:	
Religion Impact Mitigation:	

## Protected Characteristic – Sexual Orientation

Impact Sexual Orientation:	
Sexual Orientation Groups Impacted:	
Sexual Orientation Impact Details:	
Sexual Orientation Impact Mitigation:	

## Protected Characteristic – Care Experience

Impact Care Experience:	
Care Experience Impact Details:	
Care Experience Impact Mitigation:	

## Other

Any other risks or impacts:	
-----------------------------	--

## Full Assessment Summary

Full Assessment Summary:	<p>1. The Youth Service Redesign review provided evidence-based recommendations produced in collaboration with the Corporate Landlord team relating to which operational assets are suitable and should be retained for direct delivery of youth services by the council. It also identified those youth centres for which the recommendation is that there is no longer a direct delivery requirement. 2. The review also provided recommendations around surplus property assets that albeit no longer required by the service could be managed and operated to provide youth service provision but run by a different provider than the council. The Youth Service is working with Corporate Landlord to identify options in this respect and to ensure consistency with other service transformation activity where there is a direct impact on the internal requirements for corporate accommodation and a synergy with the asset disposal programme. 3. The Youth Service remodelling took into account a savings target of £2.3m for the Young People’s Services area and the budget set forward for the Youth Service aligned to a rationalised and more efficient operational footprint will make £1.247m available for staffing and £225,000 available for the continued operation of Youth Centres in corporately owned buildings. The service review that informed these recommendations gathered information on maintenance &amp; running costs, levels of need, range of locality services supporting young people in each area and views of the youth provision from young people, communities and elected members to inform recommendations. 4. During the review, which commenced in April 2024 and completed in January 2025, and the formal consultation period from October 2024 to 17th January 2025, staff &amp; young people contributed to shaping the operational delivery model and service provision. Also 40 different partners spanning education, employment, health, public health, violence, crime and Voluntary Community Sector (VCS) were engaged to gather their views. 5. This was conducted through meeting young people and staff in youth centres, a citywide “Your Priorities” survey, and face to face young people engagement sessions in colleges. The priorities of over 1500 young people were captured highlighting the social value overriding the drive to make savings. 6. The service also invited third party organisations, via Birmingham Voluntary Service Council, that are interested to work in partnership with the youth service to complete Expressions of Interest in respect of taking on responsibility for youth provision and potentially associated Youth Centres. These have</p>
--------------------------	--

been assessed against set criteria of financial viability, operational experience, track record of working with the council and document evidence such as insurance. Due to the strong response from viable organisations supported the decision to progress with a recommendation for further due diligence in respect of four centres potentially delivering services through partnership arrangements and Corporate Landlord are advising on the implications of this option and associated leasing/transfer mechanisms. 7. In an initial mapping exercise, over 45 organisations supporting young people in the city (in addition to education providers) were identified. In reality the number is much higher, but the results of this exercise illustrate the breadth of assets that the partnership has to draw upon in ensuring young people get the support they need to thrive 8. The 'Young People's Services Redesign' (Youth Service, Careers Service and 14 -19 Participation Team) sat within this context – the Review conducted in 2024 by Newton Europe understood the outcomes for Young People's Services to deliver and, in an evidenced based way, created a blueprint for how we deliver the services most effectively and most efficiently that navigates all the wider context laid out above, noting the wider landscape of children and young people's services that they sit within Principles adhered to:

- The work was led by maximising the impact we have for our Young People
- The outputs were codesigned with input from Young People & their families, service staff and system partners
- Decisions being evidence based
- Alignment to the vision of the wider portfolio of change across the Birmingham Children's Partnership.

Youth Services are also co-producing a Youth Strategy for Birmingham City, the proposed operating model resulting from the redesign, will inform a component of the Strategy. The aim is to compliment the direction of travel without predetermining the detail to be included in the Strategy. Scope 1. The scope of the Review considered identifying efficiency and cost savings in the Youth Service, Careers Service and 14-19 teams whilst maintaining capacity to carry out statutory duties. 2. Understanding the impact of the Youth Service from staff, partners and young people to inform a set of design considerations for the redesign which included reference to spatial requirements. 3. What can be learnt from other Local Authorities and national and regional bodies on the direction the rest of the country is taking around local authority supported youth work 4. What do the services need to look like March 2025 onwards to both align with the long-term vision and meet saving requirements? What does this mean in terms of asset rationalisation in terms of the current accommodation footprint occupied by the service. 5. What needs to happen to progress towards the in-year design and long-term vision? Methodology Phase 1 - To define the blueprint the following activity was delivered.

- A detailed needs analysis of local, statistical neighbours and national data.
- Engagement with Young People, Staff and Partners to define a set of design considerations
- Learning from national & regional youth service delivery by engaging directly with 7 other local authorities as well as bodies such as the National Youth Agency and Youth Focus West Midlands
- Mapping of service provision by community organisations and Birmingham City Council youth provision.
- Visits to 12 Youth Centres in which the stories of 20+ parents and 45+ young people were heard firsthand
- Responses from 1500 young People across the city via the young people's survey codesigned with the Young People's Reference Group
- Delivered design workshops with members of the Youth Service staff as well as partners from Community Safety Partnership, Public Health and Birmingham Children's Trust.
- Open-up slots for 1-2-1 interviews to all Youth Service employees (with 18 slots taken up)
- Community and Voluntary organisations were invited to complete Expressions of Interest to gauge the viability of centres being managed for the delivery of youth services. In total 136 were received and assessed and scored against criteria of:

- ♣ Policy, procedures, governance and planning
- ♣ Safeguarding arrangements
- ♣ Youth service delivery experience – quality & quantity
- ♣ Financial viability
- ♣ Asset management track record

This resulted in a minimum of 2 organisations scoring as viable to manage each centre. This has given the service confidence in considering a Community Asset Transfer as a possible model of delivery. Phase 2 - Designing in detail to allow an effective transition of service as well as ensuring savings are delivered on time the below was modelled and agreed

- Identifying the specific sites affected by the change.
- Gathering Accommodation Usage data - young people attendance, needs by locality,
- Gathering general property data - building running costs, condition information, backlog maintenance & compliance costs, valuations and income potential/loss.
- Range of services in each locality supporting young people.
- Agreeing the organisational structure that defines the services.
- Defining specific roles within the new services.

## Monitoring

Monitoring Details:	The initial assessment showed a strong indication that there would be minimal impacts on people. We have identified no significant concerns or the identified negative concerns have already been addressed. The recommendation of a blended model ensures no centre will be closed and services will continue to be delivered and supported by Youth Services. These will be reduced sessions by Youth Workers in centres to be managed by partner organisations to support the transition and more importantly maintain relationships with young people attending these centres. Any adverse impact will be monitored through Key Performance Indicators by the Head of Service and Youth Service Senior managers and supported by data & insights.
Monitoring Officer Email:	soulla.yiasouma@birmingham.gov.uk

