

Public Document Pack

Children and Young People Select Committee Supplementary Agenda

Tuesday, 8 September 2015

7.30 pm, Committee Room 3 - Civic Suite

Civic Suite

Lewisham Town Hall

London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Katie Wood (Tel: 020 8314 9446)

This meeting is an open meeting and all items on the agenda may be audio recorded and/or filmed.

Part 1

Item		Pages
3.	Savings Report (Lewisham Future Programme 2016/17 Revenue Budget Savings Proposals	1 - 276

This page is intentionally left blank

Children and Young People Select Committee			
Report Title	Lewisham Future Programme 2016/17 DRAFT Revenue Budget Savings Proposals		
Key Decision	No	Item No.	3
Ward	All Wards		
Contributors	Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration		
Class	Part 1	Date:	8 September 2015

REASONS FOR URGENCY AND LATENESS

Despatch of this report is late for the Children and Young People Select Committee because:

Urgency: Given the continuing financial pressures the Council is facing it is necessary for these savings proposals to be scrutinised as soon as possible so that these proposals can be presented to the Mayor and the momentum maintained with identifying savings.

Lateness: To enable members to see the proposals in the round, additional time was taken to bring them together in a single report to facilitate their consideration by scrutiny.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – DRAFT PROPOSALS

- 1.1. This is the next stage of the savings process for members to scrutinise ahead of future years budget setting. These are being put forward by officers from the work of the Lewisham Future Programme.
- 1.2. This report updates members on the work of the Lewisham Future Programme and puts forward £12m of new savings proposals for 2016/17 developed by officers over the last six months for member pre-scrutiny prior to Mayor & Cabinet on the 30 September and a further £14m for 2017/18.
- 1.3. The Council is now in the sixth year of an expected ten year long period of resource reduction. In the period 2010 to 2015 the Council made savings of over £120m. The Council developed principles by which savings are made during the period 2010 to 2015 and these continue to apply (see Appendix 15). The Council recognises that this level of continual reduction also means that proposals need to be increasingly transformational and are becoming increasingly difficult to identify and implement. For this reason the Lewisham Future Programme was established in 2013.
- 1.4. This report presents the work of the Lewisham Future Programme since the budget in February 2015 to progress the transformational changes necessary to enable the Council to seize the opportunities of growth in London and reposition itself to meet the future needs of the communities it serves, while at the same time living within the financial resources at its disposal.
- 1.5. At this time two things about the savings are clear. For the un-protected areas of public sector spending, which includes Local Government, austerity will continue to

2019/20 with savings expected in each fiscal year. And, pending the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in November and the provisional Local Government Financial Settlement (LGFS) in December, there is considerable uncertainty about the actual level of savings required in the next four years to 2019/20.

- 1.6. The Council is therefore continuing with its plan to identify £45m of savings over the next two years to 2017/18 and preparing to accelerate actions if necessary to enable it to be flexible and close any savings gap that emerges from the CSR and LGFS. This is a continuous process, and as agreed when the Lewisham Future Programme was set up, will require savings to be brought forward for scrutiny, consultation and decision as and when they are ready. With the key requirement remaining the statutory obligation for Council to set a balanced budget by March each year.
- 1.7. In addition to the savings of £12m for 2016/17, the report also presents £13m of new proposals for 2017/18 and a summary of the work ongoing to prepare these savings and, where necessary, close the remaining gap to achieve the £45m target. The estimated saving requirement for 2016/17 is between £25m and £35m.
- 1.8. Finally the report then sets out the necessary financial and legal implications that are required to be considered in respect of these proposals (sections 9 and 10). And concludes with some additional steps that might be taken, if required, to address any budget gap for 2016/17 in the budget report in February 2016.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1. To set out the revenue budget savings proposals that need to be scrutinised.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1. Members are invited to scrutinise these proposals through September and provide feedback to the Mayor ahead of the Mayor & Cabinet meeting on 30 September.

4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

- 4.1. The report is structured into the following sections with supporting Appendices.

Section	Title
1	Executive summary
2	Purpose of the report
3	Recommendations
4	Structure of the report
5	Lewisham's Future Funding Outlook (Update)
6	Lewisham Future Programme
7	Timetable
8	Savings proposals by thematic review
9	Financial implications

10	Legal implications
11	Conclusion
12	Background documents
	Appendices

5. LEWISHAM'S FUTURE FUNDING (Update)

- 5.1. Pending the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in November and the provisional Local Government Financial Settlement (LGFS) in December, there is considerable uncertainty around the funding that Local Authorities will receive over the duration of this Government to 2019/20. The Council has considered the Local Government Association (LGA) and London Councils modelling along with its own best assumptions.
- 5.2. In July 2015 Lewisham's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) to 2019/20 was presented to Mayor & Cabinet. These uncertainties were recognised in the range of the possible outcomes considered – best, base and worst case scenarios. After allowing for the £11m of savings previously agreed for 2016/17 and 2017/18, the MTFS savings estimates to 2019/20 ranges from £57m to £105m.
- 5.3. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced in his summer budget on 8 July 2015 that he would slow the pace of spending cuts by shifting his target of running a budget surplus by a year to 2019/20 in order to avoid a "rollercoaster-ride in public spending". This means that the reduction to overall government Resource Department Expenditure Limit (DEL) is less steep in 2016/17 and 2017/18 but higher for 2018/19 and 2019/20 than forecast in the March budget. All non-protected Departments have been asked to model 25% and 40% funding reductions. How much of these Departmental reductions go on to impact funding for Local Authorities is not yet clear.
- 5.4. Towards the end of July 2015, London Councils produced their funding predictions, specific to each London Borough, for the period up to 2019/20. This included six scenarios to model forecasted funding. The six options for Lewisham range from £15m to £130m. An even wider range than in the Council's MTFS.
- 5.5. Given the headline of austerity in non-protected areas of public spending is to continue and the uncertainty in potential impacts for local government to 2019/20, this report updates on the savings proposals prepared against the current target of £45m for 2016/17 and 2017/18. It also recognises the risk that this may leave a gap for Lewisham's budget when the LGFS is confirmed in December. The savings targets for each strand will be reviewed once the LGFS is announced in December 2015 and the Council's funding level is certain.

6. LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME

- 6.1. The Lewisham Future programme is the Council's approach to making the transformational changes necessary to reposition itself strongly for the future while living within the financial resources at its disposal. It is guided by the Council's enduring values and principles agreed in 2010 (see Appendix X), the elected

administration's manifesto commitments, and its emerging political priorities for the savings.

- 6.2. Since 2010 over £120m of savings have been made, and in many cases the size and shape of the Council's services have changed dramatically. It also means that at this stage many savings options have been considered with some advancing to form proposals and many rejected as unfeasible or unreasonable.

Meeting the challenge

- 6.3. For the reasons set out in section 5 above, the Council is continuing with its current target to make £45m of savings over the next two years to 2017/18, while at the same time preparing to accelerate actions if necessary to enable it to be flexible and close any savings gap that emerges from the CSR and LGFS in late 2015.
- 6.4. The Lewisham Future Programme Board agreed targets for each work strand in February 2015 and then between March and June considered and challenged options for how these savings could be made from the respective work strand leads. The results of this work are presented in this report.
- 6.5. The intention was to identify option for how the full £45m target could be achieved over the two years to 2017/18. However, this has proved difficult as the options to change services at the scale and in the timeframes available that also bring service users and staff along the journey is very challenging, especially given the journey already travelled since 2010. The result is that the proposals presented, and assuming all were to be agreed, are likely to be short of the total required for 2016/17. Therefore, in addition to this report further savings will need to be identified and brought forward for 2016/17 as we continue the savings journey over the next four years.
- 6.6. This report recaps on the savings previously agreed in Table B below and looks to the new proposals in Table A below. Section 9 of the report summarises the scope of each Lewisham Future Programme work strands, presents a list of the individual savings being proposed, and describes the work ongoing to close the gap and achieve the original £45m target. For each of the listed proposals proforma with the detail necessary to enable pre-scrutiny, public consultation (if required), and decisions to be taken are presented in the appendices.
- 6.7. The focus at this time is on the savings for 2016/17. This is a continuous process, and as agreed when the Lewisham Future Programme was set up, will require savings to be brought forward for scrutiny, consultation and decision as and when they are ready, with the key requirement remaining the statutory obligation for Council to set a balanced budget each year.

Table A: Outline of Revenue Budget Savings Proposals

Ref	LFP work strand	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	To Follow £'000	Key Decision	Public/ Staff Consultation	Appendix
A	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)	3,007	3,703	6,710	3,190	Y	Y	1
B	Supporting People	0	1,200	1,200	800	Y	N	2
F	Business Support & Customer Transformation	278	95	373	2,900	N	Y	3
G	Income Generation	1,050	250	1,300	1,300	N	Y	4
H	Enforcement and Regulation	0	1,200	1,200		Y	Y	5
I	Corporate & Management Overheads	2,610	2,205	4,815	1,700	N	Y	6
J	School Effectiveness	660	0	660	240	N	Y	7
K	Crime reduction/ Drug and Alcohol Services	50	340	390	0	Y	N	8
L	Culture and Community	400	2,600	3,000	0	Y	Y	9
M	Housing and non HRA funded services	200	0	200	0	N	N	10
N	Environmental Services	2,350	1,250	3,600	600	Y	Y	11
O	Public Services	120 to 300	0 to 20	140 to 300	627 to 787	Y	Y	12
P	Planning	230	325	555	0	Y	Y	13
Q	Safeguarding and Early Intervention	875	640	1,515	75	N	Y	14
	Total	11,830 to 12,010	13,808 to 13,828	25,658 to 25,818				

Previously Agreed Savings

- 6.8. In addition to the above, in November 2014, the Mayor agreed savings for 2016/17 and 2017/18 which had been identified and proposed in advance of requirement. These will be presented to the Mayor for endorsement. The savings are shown in table B below:

Table B: Previously Agreed Revenue Budget Savings Proposals

LFP Area		16/17	17/18	Summary of Saving
Ref	LFP Work Strand	£'000	£'000	
B	Supporting People	1,174	0	Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity, reductions in service capacity and service closures
D	Efficiency Review	2,500	2,500	Withholding non-pay inflation
E	Assets*	760	985	Efficiencies in the current facilities management contracts and optimising the current operational estate
F	Business Support & Customer Transformation	0	1,000	Establishment of a centrally located, corporate business support service which combines a general support function with specialist service hubs
K	Crime reduction	30	0	Tendering a number of services to increase efficiencies while reducing and targeting provision such as residential rehabilitation.
L	Culture and Community	375	0	Review of main VCS grants programme.
M	Housing and non HRA funded services	200	100	Transfer of non-Housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund
O	Public Services	200	0	The internal bailiff service will generate income from the statutory fees charged to debtors. The 'saving' is the net surplus income once operational costs have been taken into account.
Q	Safeguarding and Early Intervention	1,223	111	Further savings to the Children's Social Care placement and other budgets. In this strand
Total		6,462	4,696	

* Assets and the potential to develop future revenue streams are a key strand for the Lewisham Future Programme. While there are no new proposals for Assets in the current set of proposals, work continues apace to evaluate further options in this area. These will be brought forward in due course.

7. LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME : TIMETABLE

8.1 Working towards setting the Council's annual budget for 2016/17 in February 2016 the key dates for considering the savings proposals via scrutiny and the key Mayor and Cabinet (M&C) dates are as follows:

Review of Savings proposals	Children & Young People	Healthier	Housing	Public Accounts	Safer Stronger	Sustainable
Select Ctte.	8 Sep	09 Sept	16 Sept	29 Sept	16 Sept	15 Sept
M&C	30 Sep	30 Sep	30 Sep	30 Sep	30 Sep	30 Sep
Select Ctte.	18 Nov	12 Nov	01 Dec	02 Dec	30 Nov	26 Nov
M&C	09 Dec	09 Dec	09 Dec	09 Dec	09 Dec	09 Dec
Select Ctte.	12 Jan	13 Jan	26 Jan	27 Jan + Budget	19 Jan	14 Jan
M&C	10 Feb	10 Feb	10 Feb	10 Feb + Budget	10 Feb	10 Feb

8.2 Each M&C decision is then subject to the usual Business Panel scrutiny call in process and reconsideration at the following M&C if necessary.

8. SAVING PROPOSALS BY THEMATIC REVIEW

8.1. For each of the eighteen work strands of the Lewisham future programme the remainder of this section sets out two things. They are:

- An overview of the work strand and approach being taken to identify the savings proposals required to 2017/18, and
- A summary of the specific proposals being brought forward for scrutiny and decision now.

8.2. Each proposal is supported by a pro-forma saving template and, where necessary (usually when public consultation is required), accompanied by a full report. The pro-forma and full reports are provided in the Appendices.

A. Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

8.3. Overview

Proposals - A	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£3.0m	£3.7m	£6.7m
To follow			£3.2m
Total			£9.9m

8.4. The Adult and Social Care (ASC) is currently going through its most radical transformation, driven in the main by the Care Act which became operational from 1st April 2015. The different tenets of the Act will lead to both increased and decreased expenditure across ASC provision. It is within this context that opportunities to identify savings have been explored.

8.5. The savings, agreed last February, were developed in accordance with the legislation that governs the deliver of ASC. The 15/16 savings are to be achieved

primarily within a clear framework that ensures the people's needs are being met in the most cost effective way.

- 8.6. A similar approach has been followed to identify the proposals that contribute to the £4.9m of savings outlined in this paper.

Summary of proposed savings

- 8.7. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

A. Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health – Appendix 1							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
A11	Managing and improving transition plans	200	300	500	Y	N	N
A12	Reducing costs of staff management, assessment and care planning	500	200	700	Y	N	Y
A13	Alternative Delivery Models for the provision of care and support services, including mental health	1,100	700	1,800	Y	Y	Y
A14	Achieving best value in care packages	600	500	1,100	N	N	N
A15	New delivery models for extra care – Provision of Contracts	100	900	1,000	Y	Y	N
A16	Prescribed Medication	130		130	N	N	N
A16	Dental Public Health	20		20	N	N	N
A16	Health Protection		23	23	N	N	N
A16	Obesity/Physical Activity	232		232	N	N	N
A16	Health Inequalities	100		100	N	N	N
A16	Workforce development	25		25	N	N	N
A16	Redesign through collaboration		580	580	Y	N	N
A17	Sexual Health Transformation		500	500	Y	Y	N
TOTAL				6,710			

Work ongoing

- 8.8. In order to achieve the remainder of the savings target (a further £3.2m) we will need to continue to push the integration agenda with Health, this will, amongst other things, deliver effective advice and support for self-care, develop and improve access to community based care, and link individuals to community networks of support.
- 8.9. Alternative delivery models for specific services (e.g. transition from Children's to Adult's) or establishing a Care Trust (similar to the current model in Essex) need to be explored. Feasibility work is underway looking at the potential benefits of

establishing a Care Trust. However, for that option to be progressed significant political and strategic support would be required.

- 8.10. In addition, we will need to seek further efficiencies from our contracts; this will enable us to deliver the same service at lower cost.
- 8.11. We must also look again at our Public Health spend and ensure it continues to be used in the most effective way possible to support our public health outcomes (e.g. early intervention services, environmental protection enforcement, and hygiene in the community).
- 8.12. The wider political landscape will also have an impact on the future structure of adult social care. Nevertheless, it is critical we continue to drive down costs ahead of any structural changes to the sector.

B. Supporting People

8.13. Overview

Proposals - B	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now		£1.2m	£1.2m
To follow		£0.8m	£0.8m
Total			£2.0m

- 8.14. The supporting people service funds housing related support via a number of providers to clients with varying needs. These range from high-support hostels to floating support in the community. The total spend on these services in 2014/15 was £8.4m. To date savings proposals have been put forward totalling £2.5m across 15/16 and 16/17.
- 8.15. In order to meet the reduced budget requirement for the service in 2017/18, the service will need to further remodel how it provides housing support. Officers have remodelled the initial proposals working on the following assumptions:
 - Significant savings are required from this budget and it is not possible to deliver these without having some impact on current users, although every effort will be made to keep this to a minimum where possible.
 - Direct cost shunts should be avoided (e.g. closing a service where a large proportion of users will directly require another Council funded service as a result of the closure).
 - Alternative sources of funding to support this client group should be explored (e.g. Housing Benefit).
 - Other support networks should be considered in order to ensure that existing service users can continue to receive some level of support if funding is withdrawn.

Summary of proposed savings

- 8.16. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

B. Supporting People – Appendix 2							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
B2	Individual service users will no longer receive a service in their own homes and some will need to be decanted from accommodation based services.		1,200	1,200	Y	N	N
TOTAL				1,200			

Work ongoing

- 8.17. Using the principles outlined above it is anticipated that the maximum that could be saved before the implications and cost shunts become unknowable and potentially counterproductive is approximately £1.2m. Should savings at this level be pursued, it would then be possible to determine the extent to which a further reduction of £0.8m would be feasible without resulting in significant cost shunt.
- 8.18. The figure of £1.2m still contains risks which would be largely mitigated if the saving was reduced to £0.5m. Savings of £2.0m would likely lead to significant but unquantifiable cost shunts to other Council services

F. Business Support and Customer Service Transformation

8.19. Overview

Proposals - F	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£0.278m	£0.95m	£0.37m
To follow			£2.90m
Total			£3.27m

- 8.20. The Corporate and Business Support Services work strand and the Customer Transformation work strand have now been merged due to the overlapping areas in how they could be delivered through improved use of technology. This work strand primarily relates to the large proportion of staff within the business support review that are responsible for key elements of end-to-end customer contact.
- 8.21. Following a comprehensive review of the business support and administrative services across the organisation, a model for a centralised business support service was developed that combines a general support function from service related hubs. Consultation for the new service began in February 2015 and the new structure is expected to be in place by September 2015. The new structure is operating at a 20% reduction across all of the posts in scope (resulting in a saving of £0.9m for 15/16).
- 8.22. Further technical and process redesign will be undertaken once the new service is fully embedded, this is hoped to enable additional savings of £1.1m, although

combined with the further £1.0m still to be implemented in 17/18 already agreed, in total these services would be reduced by over 60%.

- 8.23. The Customer Transformation Review has been adopting a whole systems approach to review customer contact management and end to end service delivery utilising technology to automate process where possible.

Summary of proposed savings

- 8.24. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

F. Business Support and Customer Transformation – Appendix 3							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
F2a	Improve our online offer, starting with environmental services.	148		148	N	N	Y
F2b	Pushing customers to self-serve online wherever possible.		52	52	N	N	Y
F3	Customer Service Centre reorganisation.	130	43	173	N	N	Y
TOTAL				373			

Work ongoing

- 8.25. The Customer Services Transformation Programme is one of the cross-cutting projects within the Lewisham Future Programme and has a £2m target for delivery by 2018. As outlined above, thus far £250k worth of savings are being proposed (£200k via changes within the call centre and optimising online channels, and £50k from a review of Casework functions, found in strand I).
- 8.26. To successfully deliver this saving whilst improving service delivery, it is not just about applying a digital ‘front-end’ to the way we work or moving customer contact online. In order to realise the benefits of increased digital contact, front and back office processes need to be integrated to create a fully digital service.
- 8.27. We want to develop a holistic approach to digital transformation supported by a streamlined, easy-to-use digital platform for customer contact. Not only will this provide a high quality customer service, it will also encourage customers to engage with us digitally as much as possible, reducing the need for more costly face to face or telephone contact. Our digital services need to be so good that customers prefer to interact digitally over any other channel, and in some areas should be good enough to be the only option for customer wanting to transact with the council.
- 8.28. Following implementation of the first phase of the project (focused on Environmental Services) the second phase of the project will expand to include other services with high volumes of customer contact, for example, school admissions, building control and registrations. It is expected that small scale

savings will be identified from each service area reviewed as part of this work strand. As there is no dedicated budget from which the saving is to be taken, identifying the required £1.8m will be challenging and the piecemeal approach likely to be relatively time and resource intensive.

G. Income Generation

8.29. Overview

Proposals - G	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£1.05m	£0.25m	£1.3m
To follow			£1.3m
Total			£2.6m

8.30. This review is considering approaches to optimise income generation. The income strategy is intended to ensure that where the Council has in place fees, charges and sources of income they are guided by certain principles and managed in a thoughtful and consistent way.

8.31. The guiding principle of the income generation strand is to ensure that income can be a means by which to ensure a service is sustainable in the longer term. The risk is that, if not implemented in a fair and transparent way, it can lead to a lack of engagement and distrust in the service and Council as a whole. Therefore, it is essential that we engage with services and service users throughout this process.

8.32. In delivering our strategic approach to income generation, the Council has established an Income Generation Board. This Board comprises three heads of service (Head of Financial Services, Head of Corporate Resources and the Head of Public Services) and two support staff. The Public Accounts Select Committee is currently conducting a review of income generation following which recommendations may be made to Mayor & Cabinet.

Summary of proposed savings

8.33. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

G. Income Generation – Appendix 4							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
G2	Commercial Opportunities: Increase advertising income	300		300	N	N	N
G2	Wireless Concessions: Explore potential to install wireless connections in street furniture using a concession licence in exchange for income.	200		200	N	N	N
G2	Review of regulatory restrictions for	300		300	N	N	N

G. Income Generation – Appendix 4							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	the HRA, DSG and Capital Programme and review of treasury management						
G2	Increase sundry debt collection.	250		250	N	N	N
G2	Parking: Review service level arrangements.		250	250	N	Y	Y
TOTAL				1,300			

Work ongoing

- 8.34. This review aims to identify the potential to generate at least a further £1.3m of income per annum. Following the assessment of whether service areas are charging in line with the income policy and strategy, a further area of work is underway to implement an annual review of fees and charges review to maintain this focus.
- 8.35. The review includes the initial creation of a database of all services where fee charging activity takes place. The review will cover circa £100m of income to the Council and there is potential to generate significant levels of income. Instilling this discipline will ensure that potential above inflation increases for some services are achieved. Having an agreement as to how we capture and attribute the additional income will be central to this being successful.

H. Enforcement and Regulation

8.36. Overview

Proposals - H	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now		£1.2m	£1.2m
To follow			
Total			£1.2m

- 8.37. The focus of the Enforcement and Regulation review thus far has been to establish a new service covering Crime, Enforcement and Regulation and Environmental Health. The newly established team covers the following functions:
- Crime Reduction
 - Environmental Protection
 - Food Safety
 - Public Health and Nuisance
 - Licensing
 - Trading Standards

- 8.38. Via restructuring the service areas in scope and creating a new team a saving of £0.8m was achieved. The team are now adopting a risk and intelligence based approach to undertaking enforcement activity.
- 8.39. In order for further savings to be achieved (£1.2m) a further reduction and re-design of the service is required, with a further expansion of the risk and intelligence based approach established through the recent restructure.
- 8.40. The review does not include some other regulatory services such as Street Enforcement, Building Regulations and Enforcement under regeneration and Environmental Protection (e.g. rogue landlords) under housing.

Summary of proposed savings

- 8.41. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

H. Enforcement and regulation – Appendix 5							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
H2	Further reductions in Crime, Enforcement and Regulation and Environmental Health		1,200	1,200	Y	N	Y
TOTAL				1,200			

Work ongoing

- 8.42. In order to retain resilience and to share knowledge, opportunities to share the functions within this service are being explored with neighbouring boroughs.

I. Management and corporate overheads

- 8.43. Overview

Proposals - I	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£2.6m	£2.2m	£4.8m
To follow			£1.7m
Total			£6.5m

- 8.44. This review is of all management and professional back office functions, with the aim of further reducing spend by between 30-50%. Thus far, proposals totalling £2.1m have been put forward for 15/16, the savings come from the following service areas:
- Policy, Performance, Service redesign and research & intelligence functions
 - Governance and Strategy
 - Human Resources
 - Legal Services

- Corporate Resources
- Finance
- CYP Resources.

8.45. The remaining target for the management and corporate overheads review is £6.5m. To achieve this target, all back-office services will need to be reduced further and some non-statutory services may need to be stopped entirely.

Summary of proposed savings

8.46. The table sets out in summary the individual proposals.

I. Management and Corporate Overheads – Appendix 6							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
I2a	Policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence		180	180	N	N	Y
I2b	Senior management executive support	100		100	N	N	Y
I2c	Governance		75	75	N	N	Y
I3	Reorganisation of how Complaints are managed across the Council.	50		50	N	N	Y
I4a	Review of Programmes in Strategy and Mayor and Cabinet Office	150		150	N	N	Y
I4b	Restructure of Communications after voluntary redundancies	60		60	N	N	N
I5	Commissioning and Procurement: undertake base lining of current activity and focus time only on value add activities.	500	500	1,000	Y	N	Y
I6	Insurance and Risk: review liabilities and re-charge premiums to ensure they are contributing for the whole risk, not just direct costs.	300		300	N	N	N
I7	Finance non-salary budget and vacancies review	100	150	250	N	N	N
I8	Minor reorganisation of Legal Services to incorporate Procurement function	50		50	N	N	Y
I9a	HR support	20	200	220	N	N	Y
I9b	TU Secondments	40		40	N	N	Y
I9c	Graduate Schemes	40		40	N	N	N
I9d	Social Care Training		100	100	N	N	N
I9e	Realign Schools HR Recharge	100		100	N	N	N
I10a	Revising IT infrastructure support arrangements and Contract, systems and supplies review	1,000	1,000	2,000	Y	N	Y

I. Management and Corporate Overheads – Appendix 6							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
I10b	Committee Papers: move to digital access only	100		100	N	N	N
TOTAL				4,815			

Work ongoing

- 8.47. In order to make further savings from back office functions such as those in scope of this review shared services approaches will be explored.

J. School Effectiveness

8.48. Overview

Proposals - J	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£0.66m		£0.66m
To follow			£0.24m
Total			£0.90m

- 8.49. This strand is looking at all aspects of services to schools to identify opportunities to increase income or reduce levels of service. The current proposals include a reduction in central funding for Educational Psychologists; through grant substitution from the DSG around the management of our early years functions and from the Basic Needs Grant for staff working on the expansion of school places.

Summary of proposed savings

- 8.50. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals

J. School Effectiveness – Appendix 7							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
J2a	Schools SLA: Apply an above inflation 2.5% increase to schools SLAs.	100		100	N	N	N
J2b	Attendance and Welfare: We currently deliver our core statutory offer plus some traded services within this area. A further	150		150	Y	N	N

J. School Effectiveness – Appendix 7							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	restructure and increase in traded services could result in further savings.						
J2c	Schools IT Infrastructure: Schools Strategic IT support to be traded or withdrawn.	118		118	N	N	N
J2d	Educational Psychologists: Service reorganisation and further trading where possible.	5		5	N	N	N
J2e	Estates Management: Service re-organisation, improved coordination with property services, and reduced provision for property consultancy services.	220		220	N	N	Y
J2f	Free School Meals Eligibility: Service transfer to Customer Services financial assessments team.	17		17	N	N	Y
J2g	Management Restructure of the Standards and Achievement team.	50		50	N	N	Y
TOTAL				660			

Work ongoing

- 8.51. The proposals for the next two years will be discussed with the Schools Forum in September, specifically the scope for further price increases of traded services.

K. Drug and Alcohol Services

8.52. Overview

Proposals - K	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£0.05m	£0.34m	£0.39m
To follow			£0m
Total			£0.39m

- 8.53. This is a review of Drug & Alcohol and Youth Offending Services to identify opportunities for reshaping provision.

Summary of proposed savings

- 8.54. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

K. Drug and Alcohol – Appendix 8							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
K4	Reducing the length of time that methadone (Heroin substitute) is prescribed, re-procurement of the main drug and alcohol service, and greater use of community rehabilitation	50	340	390	Y	N	N
TOTAL				390			

L. Culture and Community Services

8.55. Overview

Proposals - L	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£0.40m	£2.60m	£3.0m
To follow			
Total			£3.0m

8.56. The Culture and Community Development service covers a broad range of areas including leisure, libraries, local assemblies and the grants programme.

8.57. In identifying areas where savings could be achieved, the review leads have focused on the biggest areas of spend within the service. The majority of provision within the strand is discretionary so large scale reductions are possible, however some of these have significant implications for the community.

Summary of proposed savings

8.58. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

L. Culture and Community Services – Appendix 9							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
L5	Reduce the level of grant funding to the voluntary sector by £1,000,000 from 1 April 2017/18. This is the final year of the current main grants programme and will require the reduction/removal of funding from a range of organisations currently		1,000	1,000	Y	Y	N

L. Culture and Community Services – Appendix 9							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	receiving funding.						
L6	Library and Information Service: 1. Creation of three Hub Libraries – Deptford Lounge, Lewisham and Downham Health & Leisure Centre – which will carry an enhanced role for face to face contact between the Local Authority and the public to support the digital by default agenda.. 2. the extension of the Lewisham Community Library Model to Forest Hill, Torridon, and Manor House, in partnership with other council services and community organisations. And the integration of the library provision into the repurposed ground floor space within the Catford complex (Laurence House). 3. the regrading of front line staff to include new functions through the re-training and enhancement of front line roles.	400	600	1,000	Y	Y	Y
L7	Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services		1,000	1,000	Y	Y	N
TOTAL				3,000			

Work ongoing

- 8.59. In addition to the options outlined above, the service area is exploring opportunities to discuss variations to the existing leisure contracts in respect of their duration, subsidies/concessions and financing in the case of the PFI.

M. Housing Strategy and non-HRA funded services

8.60. Overview

Proposals - M	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£0.2m		£0.2m
To follow			
Total			£0.2m

8.61. This review covers the whole of the Strategic Housing Division (including Housing Needs, Private Sector Housing Agency and Housing Strategy & Programmes). It aims to identify how services can be reshaped to meet rising demand at a lower cost, as well as creating opportunities to generate additional income.

Summary of proposed savings

8.62. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

M. Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services – Appendix 10							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
M2a	Review of funding streams across housing strategy, development and partnership functions	140		140	N	N	Y
M2b	Reduction in premises costs	60		60	N	N	N
TOTAL				200			

Work ongoing

8.63. Housing services are facing a period of unprecedented change and demand, particularly at a London level.

8.64. Structural changes within the strategic housing service have been implemented in order to respond to some of these challenges. The structural changes aims to improve integration across the Housing Needs, Housing Strategy and Private Sector Housing functions.

N. Environmental Services

8.65. Overview

Proposals - N	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£2.35m	£1.25m	£3.6m
To follow			£1.1m
Total			£4.7m

8.66. This is a review of key environment services, including waste collection and disposal, street cleansing and bereavement. An externally commissioned review of waste disposal services has recently been undertaken as part of a London-wide efficiency programme. The review has identified options including changes to the frequency of collection of waste and recycling, charging for elements of the collection process and introducing different vehicle types.

Summary of proposed savings

8.67. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

N. Environmental Services – Appendix 11							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
N3	Review of Lewisham's Waste Services (Doorstep collection & disposal) Transfer of estates Bulky Waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes	600	500	1,100	Y	Y	Y
N4	Provide a mobile, 'as required', response service for residential roads instead of traditional 'beat cased' sweeper.	1,000		1,000	Y	Y	Y
N5	Review of Lewisham's Passenger Transport Service.	500	500	1,000	Y	Y	Y
N6	To develop our Trade Waste customer base, improve efficiency and increase income. To negotiate an increased share of income from Parks Events.	250	250	500	Y	Y	N
TOTAL				3,600			

Work ongoing

- 8.68. In order to identify the remaining target for this review strand (£0.6m) further options linked to the frequency of waste collection are being explored.

O. Public Services

- 8.69. Overview

Proposals - O	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£0.12m to £0.3.0m	£0.0m to £0.02m	£0.14 to £0.30m
To follow			£0.63 to £0.79m
Total			£0.93m

- 8.70. The Public Service Division strategy for the delivery of savings is to move more services online, close down access channels where possible, group services together to generate economies of scale, automate the processing of work using technology and choose the most appropriate model for delivery (e.g. in house, shared or outsourced). The division is also maximizing income to reduce the cost of delivery. The Council's financial position means this approach must now be accelerated and an assertive approach taken to models of delivery that release savings.

Summary of proposed savings

8.71. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

O. Public Services – Appendix 12							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
O4	Financial Assessments: Introduce standardisation and efficiencies in approach to financial assessments.	100		100	N	N	Y
O5	Discretionary Freedom Pass: Option 1: Withdrawal of discretionary scheme.	200		200	Y	Y	N
	Option 2: Close scheme to new applicants	20	20	40			
TOTAL				140 to 300			

Work ongoing

8.72. For further savings to be achieved from within Public Services the division and their work in support of Business Support and Customer Transformation (F) will continue.

P. Planning and Economic Development

8.73. Overview

Proposals - P	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	0.230	0.325	£0.555m
To follow			
Total			£0.555m

8.74. The planning Service is actively managing a reduction of net budget through process improvement, eliminating waste, recovery of costs and income generation.

Summary of proposed savings

8.75. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals.

P. Planning and Economic Development – Appendix 13							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
P2a	Restructure of Development Management team and restructure and amalgamation of the Conservation, Urban Design and Planning Policy teams.	185		185	Y	N	Y
P2b	Substitution of part of base budget by alternative funding sources (S.106 and fee income).	45		45	Y	N	N
P2c	Further increase in charges and changes to funding coupled with savings achievable from a corporate approach to and restructure of employment services.		305	305	Y	N	Y
P2d	Review of Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on the way in which the service consults on planning applications. Efficiency savings based on paper, printing and postage costs.		20	20	Y	Y	N
TOTAL				555			

Work ongoing

- 8.76. For further savings to be achieved from the Planning service, the Head of Planning is considering further budget changes.

Q. Early Intervention and Safeguarding

8.77. Overview

Proposals - Q	16/17	17/18	Total
Proposed now	£0.875m	£0.640	£1.5m
To follow			£0.085m
Total			£1.6m

- 8.78. The safeguarding and early intervention review includes a wide range of services covering Children's Social Care, Early Intervention, Youth Services and services for Children with Complex Needs.
- 8.79. Proposals to date have focused on a re-alignment of the Early Intervention and Social Care Referral and Assessment functions to create a new approach to our front door and triage for access to services. This strand also proposes alternative delivery models and levels of provision across our early intervention providers in

Children’s Centres, Targeted Family Support (TFS) and the Family Intervention Project (FIP) to build in greater flexibility to work at lower costs.

- 8.80. For further savings to be achieved, in addition to continuing to review the options outlined above, two further broad areas have been considered – Children with Complex Needs Service and the supplies and service expenditure within Children’s Social Care.

Summary of proposed savings

- 8.81. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals

Q. Safeguarding and Early Intervention – Appendix 14							
Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
Q3a & b	Sensory Teachers (a and b)	250		250	N	N	N
Q3c	Educational Psychologists: Further reduction in staffing through not replacing staff	35		35	N	N	Y
Q3d	Occupational Therapy – management reorganisation	50		50	N	N	Y
Q3e	Reduce Carers funding	40		40	N	N	N
Q3f	Review of MAPP portage with increased health contribution.	120		120	N	N	N
Q3g	Joint commissioning with efficiencies through reorganisation and better planning of work.	50		50	N	N	N
Q4a	Social care supplies and services reduced spend.	130	240	370	Y	N	N
Q4b	Social care financial management through continued cost control on all areas of spend.	50	50	100	N	N	N
Q4c	Placements: continuing strategy to use local authority foster placements where possible.		200	200	N	N	N
Q5	Youth Service: accelerate tapering of support to Youth Service to statutory minimum (will follow decision on creation of a mutual).	150	150	300	Y	N	N
TOTAL				1,515			

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. This report is concerned with the saving proposals it presents to enable the Council to address the future financial challenges it faces. There are no direct

financial implications arising from the report other than those stated in the report itself.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Savings proposals - General Legal Implications

Statutory duties

- 10.1. The Council has a variety of statutory duties which it must fulfil by law. The Council cannot lawfully decide not to carry out those duties. Even where there is a statutory duty there is often a discretion about the level of service provision. Where there is an impact on statutory duty, that is identified in the report. In other instances, the Council provides services in pursuit of a statutory power, rather than a duty, and though not bound to carry out those activities, decisions about them must be taken in accordance with the decision making requirements of administrative law.

Reasonableness and proper process

- 10.2. Decisions must be made reasonably taking into account all relevant considerations and disregarding all irrelevant matters. These are particular to the service reductions proposed and are set out in the body of the report. It is also imperative that decisions are taken following proper process. Depending on the particular service concerned, this may be set down in statute, though not all legal requirements are set down in legislation. For example, depending on the service, there may be a need to consult with service users and/or others and where this is the case, any proposals in this report must remain proposals unless and until that consultation is carried out and the responses brought back in a further report for consideration with an open mind before any decision is made. Whether or not consultation is required, any decision to discontinue a service would require appropriate notice. If the Council has published a procedure for handling service reductions, there would be a legitimate expectation that such procedure will be followed.

Staffing reductions

- 10.3. If service reductions would result in redundancy, then the Council's usual redundancy and redeployment procedure would apply. If proposals would result in more than 20 but fewer than 100 redundancies in any 90 day period, there would be a requirement to consult for a period of 30 days with trade unions under Section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (consolidation) Act 1992. The consultation period increases to 45 days if the numbers are 100 or more. This consultation is in addition to the consultation required with the individual employees. If a proposal entails a service re-organisation, decisions in this respect will be taken by officers in accordance with the Council's re-organisation procedures.

Equalities

- 10.4. The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

- 10.5. In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 10.6. The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.
- 10.7. The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>
- 10.8. The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
 2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
 3. Engagement and the equality duty
 4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
 5. Equality information and the equality duty
- 10.9. The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>
- 10.10. The EHRC has also issued Guidance entitled “Making Fair Financial Decisions”. It appears at Appendix 16 and attention is drawn to its contents.
- 10.11. The equalities implications pertaining to the specific service reductions are particular to the specific reduction.

The Human Rights Act

10.12. Since the introduction of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) the rights set out in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) have been incorporated into UK law and can be enforced in the UK courts without recourse to the European courts.

10.13. Those articles which are particularly relevant in to public services are as follows:-

- Article 2 - the right to life
- Article 3 - the right not to be subject to inhuman or degrading treatment
- Article 5 - the right to security of the person
- Article 6 - the right to a fair trial
- Article 8 - the right to a private and family life, home and correspondence
- Article 9 - the right to freedom of thought ,conscience and religion
- Article 10 - the right to freedom of expression
- Article 11 - the right to peaceful assembly
- Article 14 - the right not to be discriminated against on any ground

The first protocol to the ECHR added

- Article 1 - the right to peaceful enjoyment of property
- Article 2 - the right to education

10.14. Some of these rights are unconditional, such as the right not to be tortured or subject to degrading treatment. Others may be limited in finite and well defined circumstances (such as the right to liberty. Others are qualified and must be balanced against the need of the wider community – such as the right to a private and family life. Where there are human rights implications associated with the proposals in this report regard must be had to them before making any decision.

Crime and Disorder

10.15. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires the Council to have regard to the likely effect on crime and disorder when it exercises its functions, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area.

Best value

10.16. The Council remains under a duty under Section 3 Local Government Act 1999 to secure continuous improvement in the way its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. It must have regard to this duty in making decisions in respect of this report.

Environmental implications

10.17. Section 40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 states that “every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions to the purpose of conserving biodiversity”. No such implications have been identified in this report.

Specific legal implications

10.18. Members' attention is drawn to the specific legal implications arising in relation to particular proposals set out in this report. These will continue to be reviewed and updated as these proposals are considered by members before full and final legal implications are provided in the report for Mayor and Cabinet.

11. CONCLUSION

11.1. The Council expects to need to make further savings between now and 2019/20. However the amount and timing is uncertain at the present time pending the Comprehensive Spending Review and Local Government Finance Settlement due in November and December respectively. For this reason the work of the Lewisham Future Programme has continued to work and present proposals against the original £45m target for 2016/17 and 2017/18.

11.2. The draft saving proposals in this report reflect the work of the Lewisham Future Programme Board between February 2015 and August 2015. This work continues to bring forward further proposals to meet the savings gap. For 2016/17, the report presents £12m of potential savings and £13m for 2017/18.

12. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

Short Title of Report	Date	Contact
Medium Term Financial Strategy	July 2015	David Austin

Appendices

- 1 A – Adult Social Care (including Public Health)
- 2 B – Supporting People
- 3 F – Business Support and Customer Transformation
- 4 G – Income Generation
- 5 H – Enforcement and Regulatory Services
- 6 I – Corporate and Management Overheads
- 7 J – School Effectiveness
- 8 K – Crime Reduction
- 9 L – Culture and Community Services
- 10 M – Housing and non HRA funded services
- 11 N – Environmental Services
- 12 O – Public Services
- 13 P – Planning
- 14 Q – Safeguarding and Early Intervention
- 15 Corporate Savings Principles
- 16 EHRC Making Fair Financial Decisions guidance
- 17 Summary of savings as navigation table

For further information on this report, please contact:
David Austin, Head of Corporate Resources on 020 8314 9114

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 1 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION A

Contents page

Section A: Smarter and Deeper Integration of Social Care and Health

A11: Managing and improving transition planning	31
A12: Reducing costs of staff management, assessment and care planning	35
A13: Alternative Delivery Models for the provision of care and support services	39
A14: Achieving best value in the provision of care packages	43
A15: New delivery models for extra care and day services – Provision of Contracts	47
A16: Public Health	51
Including: Prescribed Medication	
Dental Public Health	
Health Protection	
Obesity/Physical Activity	
Health Inequalities	
Workforce Development	
Redesign Through Collaboration	
A17: Sexual Health Transformation	59

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Managing and improving transition planning
Reference:	A11
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)
Directorate:	Adult and Community Services
Head of Service:	Joan Hutton
Service/Team area:	Adults with Learning Disabilities
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Transition planning	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>A number of young adults aged 18 with disabilities will transfer to adult social care so that their eligible needs can continue to be met. Most of the young people who come through this transition process continue into tertiary education. At present there are no college facilities in Lewisham where specialist educational requirements can be met. Therefore many of these young people attend out of borough college facilities and are residents of those colleges for the majority of the year. The residential costs for these placements are extremely high and tend to be ongoing as people remain out of borough. These costs further increase when the young person comes home during college breaks as additional packages of care need to be provided whilst they are living in their parents' or carers' homes.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>CYP Directorate has been working with providers to develop local college opportunities for young people with complex needs. In September 2016 provision for these young people will be available at the House on the Hill. In parallel the Council is developing supported living schemes to support these young students to remain within the borough.</p> <p>This local college provision, alongside the development of supported living arrangements, will reduce the need for high cost out of borough placements and reduce the associated transport and supplemented packages of care during the college holiday periods. Young adults will be able to attend college in the borough and either be supported to continue to live at home with their family or in supported living schemes within the borough.</p> <p>Adult Social Care will also be working with CYP to further develop local education offers for young people with challenging behaviour which will enable more young people to stay in the borough.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The impact on young people should be positive; they will stay within the borough and be near family, friends and local groups with whom they are familiar. The new supported living schemes will enable young people to gain independent living skills in their own homes.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk of a lack of suitable accommodation for young people with disabilities within the borough. In mitigation, existing housing provision can be reconfigured to support young people without a physical disability. Where people have a significant physical disability, officers from ASC will work with housing colleagues to consider medium term options.

CYP and ASC will work with the young person, their parents and carers at an early stage in the transition process and will ensure that the requirements of a young person's Health, Education and Care plan can be met by provision within the borough thus reducing the need for reliance on colleges out of borough.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	1,000	0	1,000
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Transition	200	300	500
Total	200	300	500
% of Net Budget	20%	30%	50%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA
Yes / No	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
2	8	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	High	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	M	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L
Gender:	M	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	L
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	L
Disability:	H	Gender reassignment:	L
Religion / Belief:	L	Overall:	M
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>The nature of these proposals are targeted at younger people with disabilities. However, the equalities impact is a positive one rather than detrimental and therefore no specific mitigation will be required.</p>			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>The Children and families Act became law on the 1 September 2014. The new law makes it clear that children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) should be supported on a consistent basis across Education, Health and Social Care from 0-25 years of age. Education Health and Care plans need to consider the needs of younger people in receipt of education. How those needs are met can be highly flexible.</p>

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September

11. Summary timetable

October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	Savings implemented for new academic year

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Reducing costs of staff management, assessment and care planning
Reference:	A12
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)
Directorate:	Adult and Community Services
Head of Service:	Joan Hutton
Service/Team area:	Adult Social Care
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Assessment and care management staffing	Yes	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

The Adult Integrated Care Programme seeks to achieve a viable and sustainable 'One Lewisham Health and Social Care System' which includes giving residents access to high quality, cost-effective pro-active care, when it is needed.

In redesigning the services which identify and determine the support and care required by service users, the Council is working with health and care partners to further align and integrate adult social care with those services in the health sector which focus on similar cohorts of people. This includes looking at potential joint management, integrated staffing, alignment of processes and systems, and establishing a range of coherent and co-ordinated services that maximise efficiencies and eradicate duplication. All partners in the programme recognise the need to achieve savings as part of this work.

These services currently include those that cover prevention and early intervention services, enhanced care and support services, and the assessment and care management that is provided by neighbourhood community teams.

Saving proposal

In collaboration with health partners and following audits of current service provision and its effectiveness, the Council is developing detailed plans for the remodelling of services across the health and care system. This will be achieved by amalgamating similar roles and establishing joint posts which are able to work across organisations. This will include those staff employed by the Council who work to support admission avoidance, hospital discharge and those staff within the neighbourhood community teams. The remodelling will also be used as an opportunity to embed further the mental health teams with the current neighbourhood teams.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Improving access, reducing duplication and improving outcomes for those most at risk will benefit residents. However, the changes to staffing structures and levels through the integration and reconfiguration of services could potentially impact negatively on staff who may not be successful in obtaining a post in any new service model.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Although some staff will continue to work within the new model, we anticipate a reduction in both management and operational staff. We will try to mitigate against this and limit the number of potential redundancies by ensuring no posts are permanently recruited to within the current teams until decisions on the new delivery models have been made.

The key stakeholders, Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group, South London and Maudsley Mental Health Trust and the Lewisham and Greenwich Healthcare Trust and the Council are required to agree how resources are utilised and ensure that their respective organisational and shared priorities are met. The Adult Integrated Care Programme supported by four workstreams has been established as the forum to agree how any risks or adverse impacts on individual organisation's priorities or resources can be minimised.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	17,221	(7,846)	9,375
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) staffing	500	200	700
Total	500	200	700
% of Net Budget	5%	2%	7%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
8	10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority –	Level of impact on second priority –	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High / Medium / Low	High / Medium / Low	people
High	High	9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes as part of service remodelling

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes but not yet known at what level or numbers
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			

9. Human Resources impact

Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The Care Act 2014 sets in legislation the duty of the local authority to promote integration of care and support with health services. *“The Local Authority must exercise its functions under this part of the act, with a view to ensuring the integration of care and support provision with health provision and health-related provision”*

In delivering this part of the act, integration and partnership between social care and health are stressed as an important element in meeting prevention outcomes: *‘The flexible use of resources should be encouraged if it improves outcomes. Coherent and integrated services are essential, not optional. Through shared involvement in activities such as supporting reablement, discharge pathways, falls prevention, nutritional advice and using community resources to prevent isolation, adult social care services and the NHS will become more closely linked. The workforce will be employed in different types of organisations, some working across traditional health and social care boundaries to deliver more integrated services. This new model of integrated care is aimed to meet the needs of the growing number of people with long-term conditions, such as dementia in the older population, and to reduce the pressure on more expensive acute healthcare services. The hope is that integrated care through service redesign and new skill mix will enable adult social care and the NHS to achieve gains in productivity. Improved relations and interaction between the two sectors [health and social care] ‘could ultimately contribute to broader cooperation, more imaginative efficiencies, and more significant savings on both sides’* (Department for Health, 2014).

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Alternative Delivery Models for the provision of care and support services, including mental health
Reference:	A13
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)
Directorate:	Adult and Community Services
Head of Service:	Joan Hutton
Service/Team area:	Adult Social Care
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Integrated service models	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Adult Integrated Care Programme seeks to achieve a viable and sustainable 'One Lewisham Health and Social Care System' which includes giving residents access to high quality, cost-effective pro-active care, when it is needed.</p> <p>In redesigning the services which identify and determine the support and care required by service users, the Council is working with health and care partners to further align and integrate adult social care with those services in the health sector which focus on similar cohorts of people. This includes looking at potential joint management, integrated staffing, alignment of processes and systems, and establishing a range of coherent and co-ordinated services that maximise efficiencies and eradicate duplication. All partners in the programme recognise the need to achieve savings as part of this work.</p> <p>These services currently include those that cover prevention and early intervention services, enhanced care and support services.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>Further work will take place during 15/16 and 16/17 to develop detailed plans for a more radical redesign of services across the system. From these plans, the Council will look to secure further savings from the redesign of its current service provision. The services that will be considered as part of the remodelling include those that support people to avoid unnecessary hospital admission, those that support hospital discharge and those that support people with long term care and health needs. Services for development will include Linkline and enablement services which are provided directly by the Council.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The Council and health partners are committed to the redesign of health and care services to improve user experience and to maximise people's independence and reduce their reliance on long term care. This work forms part of the Adult Integrated Care Programme and Better Care Fund proposals.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Co-production with stakeholders, including service users and staff, is a key design principle of the programme and their involvement in the redesign of health and care services is crucial to ensure the full benefits are realised.

The transformation of health and care in Lewisham requires money to be moved around the health and social care system to develop further services within the community that will prevent hospital admissions and support hospital discharge and maintain people to live independently in their own homes .

The key stakeholders, Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group, South London and Maudsley Mental Health Trust and the Lewisham and Greenwich Healthcare Trust and the Council are required to agree how resources are utilised and ensure that their respective organisational and shared priorities are met. The Adult Integrated Care Programme supported by four workstreams has been established as the forum to agree how any risks or adverse impacts on individual organisation's priorities or resources can be minimised.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	17,221	(7,846)	9,375
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) integrated service models	1,100	700	1,800
Total	1,100	700	1,800
% of Net Budget	12%	7%	19%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
8	10	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
High	High	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	High positive	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	High positive	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	High
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes as part of service remodelling

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					No
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	

9. Human Resources impact

Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The Care Act 2014 sets in legislation the duty of the local authority to promote integration of care and support with health services. *“The Local Authority must exercise its functions under this part of the act, with a view to ensuring the integration of care and support provision with health provision and health-related provision”*

In delivering this part of the act, integration and partnership between social care and health are stressed as an important element in meeting prevention outcomes: *‘The flexible use of resources should be encouraged if it improves outcomes. Coherent and integrated services are essential, not optional. Through shared involvement in activities such as supporting reablement, discharge pathways, falls prevention, nutritional advice and using community resources to prevent isolation, adult social care services and the NHS will become more closely linked. The workforce will be employed in different types of organisations, some working across traditional health and social care boundaries to deliver more integrated services. This new model of integrated care is aimed to meet the needs of the growing number of people with long-term conditions, such as dementia in the older population, and to reduce the pressure on more expensive acute healthcare services. The hope is that integrated care through service redesign and new skill mix will enable adult social care and the NHS to achieve gains in productivity. Improved relations and interaction between the two sectors [health and social care] ‘could ultimately contribute to broader cooperation, more imaginative efficiencies, and more significant savings on both sides’* (Department for Health, 2014).

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Managing the demand for formal social care and achieving best value in the provision of care packages
Reference:	A14
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)
Directorate:	Adult and Community Services
Head of Service:	Joan Hutton
Service/Team area:	All adult social care areas
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Achieving best value in care packages	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Approximately 87% of the Adult Social Care budget is spent on packages of care to support people to remain living at home and on placements in residential and nursing homes, both in and out of the borough.
Saving proposal
In accordance with the Care Act 2014 and the Council's political priority to strengthen community resilience, adult social care will continue with its approach to assessment and support planning. This encourages people to utilise their existing resources by linking them to the support available within their own families and communities, thus reducing the need for formal social care services.
The demand for services will continue to be managed more effectively by supporting people who meet the eligibility criteria to be as independent as possible with minimal interference from, or reliance on, the Council. Support for these residents will be focused on the provision of assistance at the time of crisis and by offering help in a way that reduces the need for the person to require long term support.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Achievement of this proposal requires a different approach and relationship with residents so they do not rely on the Council for the provision of all support to meet their needs. It also requires a different approach from practitioners who undertake the assessment and support planning function to ensure they consider an individual's own resources before determining the package of care.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

In accordance with the Care Act, training has been provided to practitioners to help them identify the potential risks to an individual in relation to their care and support needs and to determine what services are required to respond promptly and appropriately to those needs. This includes assisting people to access and utilise opportunities and support within their own families and communities.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	74,536	(17,750)	56,786
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	600	500	1,100
Total	600	500	1,100
% of Net Budget	1%	1%	2%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes		
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
8	10	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil	Low

8. Service equalities impact

		Partnerships:	
Age:	High	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	High	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Medium

For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:

Most people in receipt of care and support from adult social care will have a disability or a frailty that relates to older age or disability. However, the assessment and care planning process will ensure that eligible needs continue to be met, although not necessarily from Council resources.

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No No

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No No

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

When deciding how best to meet an individual’s care needs, the Council is entitled to take into account its own resources as well as the client’s stated preferences. In planning to meet an individual’s needs, the Council may consider the most cost effective way in which this can be done and can take into account the individual’s resources and contributions. This may include considering their family and support networks, their welfare benefits and the community resources available.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	
November 2015	Reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	work ongoing
February 2016	work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	New delivery models for extra care – Provision of Contracts
Reference:	A15
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)
Directorate:	Adult and Community Services
Head of Service:	Dee Carlin
Service/Team area:	All adult social care service areas
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Extra Care	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Council holds a number of contracts for extra care which will end in 2017. This gives the Council an opportunity to review the terms and conditions of those contracts. During this review, officers will establish whether those contracts are still required and, if so, revise the service specifications to better meet current needs and demands. This work will support the planned redesign of supported living.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The savings proposed will be achieved by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The renegotiation of existing contacts and the development of new extra care schemes to better meet local demand and need. <p>Support for people who have developed dementia and who are no longer able to live independently in their own homes is currently reliant on placements within residential and nursing home settings. The new extra care housing facilities that are being built within the borough will be used as an opportunity to develop specialist dementia support which will be a more cost effective alternative to residential care.</p> <p>In addition, extra care staff will be required to support people with a different range of needs, other than solely focusing on schemes that relate to older people. This will mean that younger adults with long term conditions will be able to remain living within the borough. Extra care providers will also deliver sustainable day time activities to meet the requirements of families who support their relative at home.</p> <p>The new service specifications will ensure that the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) no longer pays charges relating to voids within existing extra care schemes; b) further consolidates the redesign of building based day services, in particular,

3. Description of service area and proposal

- capitalising on the new and existing extra care locations;
- c) as part of new extra care commissioning, seeks an alternative local offer for younger adults with significant physical support needs and for those older people who have developed dementia, to replace the need for costly out of borough residential or nursing services;
- d) obtains further efficiencies in relation to costs of transport; and
- e) financial impact of voids in extra care will be the responsibility of the housing and care partner, and not the Council.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Extra care - the new service delivery model aims to improve outcomes for services users. An increase in local provision will ensure services users remain connected with their families and local communities, instead of having to move to out of borough placements.

Existing services, including those that provide other health and care support to these users, will be able to better integrate with locally provided extra care and day services. More local provision of this kind should improve the use of staff time as they will not have to travel out of borough to review or support service users.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

- a) Loss of income to providers who hold voids will be mitigated by offering void flats to neighbouring councils.
- b) CQC or Fire/ Health and Safety implications of co-locating people with high physical support needs will be considered during the design and development of the specification and build. There may be specific grant conditions which predicate against the consideration of Extra Care schemes for younger adults which will be mitigated by officers from housing and social care working together to identify the best scheme to fit the brief.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	7,311	(1,438)	5,873
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Extra Care	100	900	1,000
Total	100	900	1,000
% of Net Budget	2%	15%	17%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
		1. Community leadership and empowerment

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
8	10	2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	High	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L
Gender:	M	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	L
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	L
Disability:	H	Gender reassignment:	L
Religion / Belief:	L	Overall:	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>The use of extra care for younger people with physical disabilities will have a positive impact on those people but could potentially have a negative impact on older adults as the extra care that would otherwise be available for them may be reduced. Officers will, however, ensure that extra care developments meet the required demands for older people, particular those with dementia.</p>			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>The majority of these proposals relate to service contracts that are being re-commissioned for 2017 and which are currently in the early stages of development.</p> <p>The Care Act has clarified that people placed into supported living schemes, including people placed in extra care schemes remain ordinarily resident with the placing</p>

10. Legal implications

authority.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	
February 2016	
March 2016	
April 2016	Extra Care specifications completed and negotiations with existing ECH provider(s) begin
May 2016	
June 2016	ECH procurement process begins
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	Recommendation for ECH to Mayor and Cabinet
March 2017	New ECH contracts in place

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Public Health (not including sexual health, drugs & alcohol)
Reference:	A16
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Danny Ruta
Service/Team area:	Public Health
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Prescribed medication	No	No	No
b) Dental Public health	No	No	No
c) Health Protection	No	No	No
d) Obesity/Physical Activity	No	No	No
e) Health Inequalities	No	No	No
f) Workforce development	No	No	No
g) Redesign through collaboration	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>This is one of three Public Health related proposals. The other two are for Sexual Health and Drugs & Alcohol, which are reviewed in separate proformas – A17 and K4. Public health areas, such as smoking and tobacco control are not included in this review as there were significant savings achieved in 2015/16.</p> <p>Prescribed medication associated with commissioned services Local authorities are responsible with medication costs associated with public health commissioned services. In Lewisham, the services which this applies to are Substance Misuse, Stop Smoking Service and Sexual Health Services. Payments are paid to a range of providers including, Lewisham and Greenwich Trust, GPs and pharmacies.</p> <p>Dental public health This programme budget was reduced in 15/16. Most aspects of dental public health, previously commissioned at local level, are now commissioned by Public Health England or NHS England. The only element currently funded is a contribution to the Lambeth Southwark and Lewisham dental infection control nurse. The post-holder manages a programme of training and audit to ensure the best possible levels of infection control in primary care dentistry (delivered in local dental surgeries) in Lewisham. This programme is unique in the UK, given the high sero-prevalence of HIV and other blood-borne viruses locally (especially HIV and Hepatitis B). There has been a clear impact in terms of improved infection control practice. The nurse is also important in managing any major incident involving the transmission or possible</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

transmission of a blood borne virus to dental patients. Such incidents (called lookbacks) can involve the need to assess risk, trace, test and counsel large numbers of patients at risk. In recent years, the largest look-back in the history of the NHS up to that point, was carried out in Lewisham. In such incidents, the dental infection control nurse assists in the assessment of risk of individual patients.

Health Protection

Immunisation is a proven tool for controlling and eliminating life-threatening infectious diseases. It is one of the most cost-effective health investments, with proven strategies that make it accessible to even the most hard-to-reach and vulnerable populations. Recorded uptake of indicator vaccines has been below target, and as a result, significant numbers of children in Lewisham are not protected against potentially serious infections. Due to the low uptake of MMR vaccine, there was an outbreak of measles in Lewisham in 2008 with a total of 275 confirmed or suspected cases.

NHS England now has the lead responsibility for commissioning of immunisation. Lewisham retained a Clinical Immunisation Co-ordinator to lead the development and implementation of the strategy to maximize the uptake in Lewisham of all vaccines included in the national immunisation programme, due to the low uptake of immunisation which has been a problem in Lewisham for some time. Since the development of an action plan to improve uptake of vaccine locally, there has been consistent improvement in uptake in Lewisham, which has gone from being one of the boroughs with the worst levels of uptake to being above average, sometimes well above the average uptake for London as a whole. Since the changes in commissioning responsibilities, other boroughs (most of which have lost dedicated immunisation programme management resources) and London as a whole have had declining levels of vaccine uptake, but Lewisham with its dedicated immunisation programme manager has continued to improve.

Obesity/Physical Activity

Obesity now ranks alongside smoking as the main causes of premature mortality and health inequalities in the UK and in Lewisham. Interventions to tackle obesity in adults and children are a local priority of the H&WB Strategy and the C&YP Plan. They are delivered through a co-ordinated, evidence based healthy weight strategy that incorporates a wide range of actions on prevention and early intervention to self management and self care.

The interventions on obesity and physical activity support the delivery of the mandatory National Child Measurement programme and the NHS Checks programme.

In 2015/16 £147,000 was taken as savings from the obesity and physical activity budget.

Health Inequalities

The Community Health Improvement Service undertakes community development for health function. The work, undertaken by Health Improvement Officers, involves developing partnerships and networks in the community in order to create opportunities for health improvement that health trainers and other health improvement practitioners can utilise in order to reach communities who do not often access health services and interventions

3. Description of service area and proposal

Public health has funded a part time health and housing advisor to assess medical eligibility for housing (which is in addition to another post). This post has been vacant for sometime. A review of the post was proposed but has not been implemented. It is unusual for public health to fund such posts.

Workforce development

The PH training programme is aligned with the Lewisham Health and Wellbeing Strategy priorities, national health improvement priorities and mandatory LA programmes, e.g. NHS Health Checks. Participants include front line workers and volunteers from a variety of backgrounds including Lewisham Council employees, Primary Care, community and voluntary organisations. £40k savings were taken from the programme in 2015/16.

Redesign through working with CCG/ other partners

Currently Lewisham Council commissions public health services separately from key providers. Through the transformation of primary care and the whole system there is an opportunity in the future to embed some public health practice into mainstream services.

Saving proposal

Prescribed medication costs will be reduced as payment will only be made for those associated with PH commissioned services. Over the past two years, since the transfer of Public Health to Lewisham Council, expenditure on medication has been disaggregated from Clinical Commissioning Group payments to GPs, hence the higher costs in previous years.

Dental public health (£20k)

Cease Lewisham's contribution to Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham infection control nurse.

Health Protection (£23k)

Cease funding the secondment of The Clinical Immunisation Co-ordinator

Obesity/Physical Activity (£232k)

To reduce funding three physical activity initiatives that support residents to be more active. These include:

- Cease the free swimming programme for children under 16 and adults over 60
- Cease the cycling in schools programme.
- Reduce Physical activity sessions to support the NHS Health check programme

The free swimming programme offers the opportunity for eligible residents to swim for free at any of the Lewisham pools at designated times – for children this means they can only attend public and general swimming sessions that fall outside school hours or fall on weekends and school holidays, for adults the offer of free swimming is available during all public and general swimming sessions. The limitations on times and the difficulty accessing this information means that the initiative is underutilized, particularly by children. The payment for the initiative is by block contract and is not dependent on activity. This initiative is one of the mayoral commitments: to promote healthy lifestyles by continuing to provide free swimming and gym access for under 16s and over 60s.

Adults over 60 may be able to access swimming at a discounted price through the

3. Description of service area and proposal

subsidised Be Active scheme (subject to any changes and renegotiation of contractual arrangements with leisure providers).

The cycling in schools programme provides offers cycling proficiency/road safety training to school age children in 40 schools.

Health Inequalities

(A) Community Health Improvement (£70k)

Reduce value of Lewisham and Greenwich NHS Trust Community Health Improvement Service contract through a reduction in community development/health improvement functions. This follows changes to the service specification in 2015/16 to better integrate the team with Community Connexions services and streamline the functions of the team.

(B) Health and Housing (£30k)

Cease funding the part time Housing and Health post. This post is currently vacant.

Workforce development (£25k)

Cease Public Health funding to wider workforce development which contributes to public health outcomes. Workforce development costs will need to be absorbed by providers.

Service redesign through working with CCG/ other partners (£580k)

Savings will be achieved through bundling services through co commissioning of GPs e.g. health checks, smoking and including key functions within contracts with key providers e.g. smoking advisors for pregnant women to be mainstreamed into Maternity services

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Prescribed Medication

No risk

Dental public health

Since this service was established, responsibilities on the issue of dental infection control have changed. To meet the registration requirements of the Care Quality Commission all dental practices have to be able to demonstrate that they meet the relevant infection control requirements. NHS England is now the commissioner for primary care dentistry and the responsibility of the commissioning organisation to assure itself of appropriate infection control now rests with NHS England, and this is no longer a responsibility of the local health care commissioner. In addition, it is important to remember that no other area of the country has a local dental infection control service. The responsibility for managing a large lookback would no longer be a local one. Public Health England and NHS England now have this responsibility

Obesity/physical activity:

Adults over 60 will be able to access swimming at a discounted price through the subsidised Be Active scheme.

The cycling in schools programme is accessed by approximately 1877 children per

4. Impact and risks of proposal

year across 40 schools.

Health inequalities

The impact may be that of reduced community development capacity within the Community Health Improvement Service team and less outreach opportunities to 'hard to reach' groups.

Workforce Development

There is a risk that delivery of public health outcomes delivered by the wider workforce (including NHS, voluntary & community sector organisations) is reduced, and this development is not supported within partner organisations.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The implications for life expectancy and quality of life for Lewisham residents over the medium (3-10 years) and long term (10-20 years) are significant.

The impact, particularly on preventative lifestyle interventions are not **currently** resourced from any other public sector budgets. It is possible however that the impacts described above could be mitigated by the council mobilising its resources to prevent ill health, promote healthy lifestyles and make healthy choices easier for Lewisham residents. It could achieve this by :

- striving to make every contact across all council services and council commissioned services a health improving contact;
- using all available policy and planning powers to create the healthiest possible environment.
- to iterate transformative change through a process of continuous quality improvement;
- to re-commission services where the evidence suggests new approaches are not delivering desired outcomes.

Dental public health: Members of the Health Protection Committee will consider how they and the Health and Well-Being Board can be assured of continuing high standards of infection control in dentistry. The Public Health team for Lambeth and Southwark (host of the service) has already been advised of this proposed saving. NHS England will also need to be advised.

Health protection

The main risk is that the improvement in uptake of vaccine in Lewisham will cease, and that uptake might even decline. Without mitigating actions, there is a significant risk of this happening.

Mitigating actions: Recently, a Lewisham Immunisation Action Plan has been agreed with NHS England. This clearly specifies the responsibilities of all parties involved, and for the first time there is agreement as to NHS England's action at local level to improve uptake of vaccine, focussing in particular on immunisation provided by GP practices as part of primary care commissioning. This is a change in NHS England activity. In addition, Lewisham CCG is developing neighbourhood primary care networks and new population commissioning mechanisms which should be able to address the need for continued improvements in immunisation uptake. The impact of these is likely to be in the medium to longer term, and hence the proposal to delay this saving until 2017/2018.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Obesity/Physical Activity:

The risks identified include:

Likely to reduce the likelihood of participation in physical activity and contribute to an increase in the prevalence of obesity.

In 2013 91 children were injured on roads in the borough. Only 7 were cyclists. Without the training that is currently offered, this number could be significantly higher. Low numbers of children in Lewisham are able to swim 25 metres (national guidance), compared with the England average. In the last five years it is known that one child death was caused by the inability to swim a short distance.

Some adults will be able to access swimming through the subsidised Be-active scheme.

Possible mitigation for cycling in schools might include asking schools to pay for training (there is unlikely to be a good take up), or parents may be asked to pay for training (likely to increase health inequalities).

Those who have had health checks will continue to be able to access a range of activities including healthy walks and leisure centre provision. Those who are overweight or obese will be also be entitled to access the Exercise on Referral scheme.

Health Inequalities

Currently Community Development Workers and Community Facilitators are employed, in each of the four neighbourhoods. Reconfiguring the work, particularly of the Community Development workers, which currently focus on secondary prevention to encompass primary prevention may mitigate the possible impact of reduction in capacity

Workforce development

In the future funding for training for NHS staff may be accessed through Community Education Provider Networks. Public Health is liaising with the CCG and local CEPN to ensure that this included public health programmes. There will be more explicit training requirements in the contracts with providers including the delivery of mandatory training and funding of training. Public health staff will continue to provide a small limited training programme and some specialist providers will provide training to others as part of their contract terms.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	5,922	(5,922)	0
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Prescribed medication	130		130
b) Dental Public Health	20		20
c) Health protection		23	23
d) Obesity/Physical Activity	232		232
e) Health Inequalities	100		100

5. Financial information			
f) Workforce development	25		25
g) Redesign through working with CCG & other partners		580	580
Total	507	603	1110
% of Net Budget	9%	10%	19%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes		
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
9	1	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	High	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	medium	Pregnancy / Maternity:	low
Gender:	medium	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	low
Age:	medium	Sexual orientation:	low
Disability:	medium	Gender reassignment:	low
Religion / Belief:	low	Overall:	Medium/low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No

No

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

There are no specific legal implications arising from these proposals.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation) Consultation with Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Sexual Health Transformation
Reference:	A17
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Danny Ruta
Service/Team area:	Sexual Health
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Sexual Health Transformation	Yes	Technical yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

Sexual health services expenditure accounts for around 35% of the Public Health Grant. This includes sexual health (STI) and contraception clinics; long acting reversible contraception (LARC), HIV tests, pregnancy tests and condoms provided by GPs; emergency contraception, condom distribution provided by pharmacies; sexual health promotion services for HIV prevention, sexual health awareness targeted at young people, Black African and Caribbean communities and men who have sex with men. There is also a small element of online testing for STIs.

Services are open access and free at the point of delivery. This is enshrined in legislation. Due to the increase in the local population, an increase in the average number of sexual partners and decrease in the age at first sexual experience demand for these services has grown year on year, and is projected to continue to do so. Most women will access contraception services during their reproductive years, so these services need to be available to 50% of the population for this purpose. Every £1 spent on contraception gives a return of £11 making it one of the most cost effective public health interventions.

Clinic services also have an important role to play in the detection of child sexual exploitation, and identifying vulnerable young people and particularly women who may be in coercive or abusive relationships.

In 2015/16 £340k was taken as a saving from the sexual health budget. This was taken mainly from Sexual Health Promotion and HIV prevention services.

Saving proposal

A Sexual Health Transformation Programme has been developed across 22 London Boroughs to address the increase in specialist GUM provision. A clinical model is now being developed which is likely to see highly specialist sexual health service focused on fewer sites with longer opening hours. There are 3 key components to the model:

3. Description of service area and proposal

1. An online “front door” is proposed for all sexual health services across London, enabling people to get advice, online tests and be sign posted to appropriate services.
2. A centralised partner notification function for London to trace and treat partners of individuals diagnosed with an STI.
3. A rationalisation of very specialised clinic sites, with better gate keeping, and triage and self sampling available at point of entry in clinics.

It is anticipated that these services will become operational in April 2017.

In parallel to this, local services have been reviewed and commissioning plans being developed to:

- Increase the sexual health “offer” in pharmacies to include a range of contraception, STI testing and condom distribution;
- Develop and 3 borough sexual health promotion programme aimed at young people, Black communities and men who have sex with men;
- Switch on “online testing” currently being trialled in Lambeth and Southwark;
- Development of plans to re-specify and if necessary re-procure integrated sexual health and contraceptive services across Lewisham.

Savings are likely to be achieved through

- “channel switch” – i.e. diverting people from clinics to digital/online services which can be provided at less cost, including self sampling and home testing for STIs & automated results management through secure online message or SMS;
- Appropriate targeting of testing at most at risk communities through a comprehensive health promotion outreach programme procured across 3 boroughs (Lewisham, Lambeth and Southwark);
- Economies of scale realised through the delivery of a London wide sexual health website, and partner notification service for sexual partners of individuals diagnosed with an STI.

Due to the complexity of managing the system wide changes across so many different councils and the resource to deliver the reprocurement it is unlikely savings can be realised prior to full implementation in 2017-18.

The year on year rises in the demand led sexual health activity across London and in our local residents means that any year efficiencies will at best achieve a break even position due to the lack of commissioning control over providers outside of Lewisham.

Currently the majority of Lewisham residents access GUM services in central London.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Service users will be able to access services closer to home through use of digital technology and increase in pharmacy provision. However, there will be less highly specialised consultant led NHS STI clinics. Provision will be better matched to need, so service users can be seen and treated in the most efficient service which can meet their needs. For example, there will be an increase in nurse led provision and the only

4. Impact and risks of proposal

people who have a diagnosed problem will be referred to consultant led care.

Local services may need to be able to cope with increased demand, in the short term and support patients to switch to alternative routes of care such as online testing. This has proved challenging to achieve in the past.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

GUM services generate significant income to NHS Trusts and there is a risk that local authorities will not be able to implement the changes on account of lack of control of the whole system.

A comprehensive communication and consultation plan has been developed for the London Sexual Health Transformation Programme. This includes all major stakeholders, lobby groups and NHS Trusts. Meetings have already taken place with all providers to explore procurement options.

It is recommended that Sexual Health Budgets for 16/17 remain unchanged as the redesign of these services will take at least a year to implement, Savings have therefore been proposed for 2017/18 to allow for the development work required to deliver the 2017/18 transformation programme. Beyond 2017/18 it is anticipated that further savings may be realised from sexual health services.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	6,508	(6,508)	0
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Sexual Health Transformation		500	500
Total	0	500	500
% of Net Budget	0%	8%	8%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes		
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
9		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on	Level of impact on	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
main priority – High / Medium / Low	second priority – High / Medium / Low	8. Caring for adults and the older people
Medium		9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	High	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Medium
Gender:	High	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	High	Sexual orientation:	High
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>As with all public health programmes, the sexual health strategy is focused on reducing health inequalities. As above, the groups who will be particularly affected by the transformation will be young people and women who are the main users of contraceptive services and men who have sex with men and Black African and Black Caribbean population with the highest levels of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections.</p>			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no specific legal implications arising from these proposals

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation) Consultation with Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C

11. Summary timetable

	on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 2 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION B

Contents page

Section B: Supporting People

B2: Reduction in budget across all client groups

67

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Funding related to the programme known as Supporting people
Reference:	B2
LFP work strand:	Supporting People
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney
Service/Team area:	Crime Reduction and Supporting People
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities / Safer Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) reduction in budget across all client groups	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

The supporting people service funds housing related support via a number of providers to clients with varying needs. These range from high-support hostels to floating support in the community. The total spend on these services in 2014/15 was £8.4m. To date savings proposals have been put forward totalling £2.5m across 15/16 and 16/17.

In order to meet the reduced budget requirement for the service in 2017/18, the service will need to further remodel how it provides housing support. Officers have remodelled the initial proposals working on the following assumptions:

- Significant savings are required from this budget and it is not possible to deliver these without having impact on some current users.
- Direct cost shunts should be avoided (e.g. closing a service where a large proportion of users will directly require another Council funded service).
- Alternative sources of funding to support this client group should be explored.
- Other support networks should be considered in order to ensure that existing service users can continue to receive some level of support if funding is withdrawn.

Saving proposal

Individual service users will no longer receive a service in their own homes and some will need to be decanted from accommodation based services. This removal of service will be targeted to ensure that those with most needs will still receive interventions but ultimately the threshold for access to services will have to rise.

Supporting People (SP) funded services are generally preventative services and this reduction of capacity may impact on higher level services such as residential care.

3. Description of service area and proposal

However, the exact level of this impact is difficult to quantify as individuals will react differently to the withdrawal of services with some coping well and other deteriorating. This impact is expected to be greatest through the reduction in floating support.

The vast majority of the funding reductions will be passed to the providers of the frontline services (including those in the voluntary sector) in the form of:

- Reduced support for mental health, learning disability and single homeless clients
- Closure of provisions for vulnerable groups such as alcohol dependant.
- Closure of units for single homeless.
- Decommission floating support and replace with a crisis management targeted floating support service with reduced capacity and for all client groups

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Reductions may result in:

- cost shunts to other parts of the Council specifically in relation to Adult Social care and housing
- reduction in individual available places may result in lack of places for clients.
- More work for partners such as the police, probation, mental health SLAM and the hospital if incidents escalate.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

1. People becoming homeless

Any losses to the floating support service will carry increased risk of more individuals becoming homeless

2. Impact on statutory services/temporary accommodation/residential care

Loss of hostel bed spaces may lead to pressure elsewhere for council resources.

3. Increased risk of safeguarding cases and services failure

Further reductions in funding may impact on staff quality and morale potentially putting service users at risk

4. Increased use of existing hostels by high needs out of borough clients

The loss of buildings currently used as hostel accommodation is in itself a significant one.

5. A rise in rough sleeping

Numbers of people living on the streets in Lewisham may rise

6. A rise in Anti Social Behaviour on the streets

Anti social behaviour on the streets in Lewisham may rise

7. Financial Viability

Remaining services become financially unsustainable for providers and they withdraw from the market.

Work will be undertaken to ensure there is ongoing and detailed communication with partners and agencies that deliver services such as outreach provision and where possible discussions with a range of voluntary and community groups will take place.

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	6,867	(514)	6,353
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)		1,200	1,200
Total		1,200	1,200
% of Net Budget	%	19%	19%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	n/a		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
8	9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	High	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	all
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	all

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L
Gender:	H	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	H	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The nature of the services see funding reductions mean that the impact on certain groups is likely to be higher than others.			

8. Service equalities impact

Statutory Consultation will be required in relation to some of the reductions. Engagement and non statutory consultation will be required with the current users, referral agencies and current providers in relation to the proposed cuts affecting other services which the Council supports.

An EAA will be required and a full report to Mayor and Cabinet will detail assessments and set out actions reduce these impacts as far as possible .

Statutory Consultation will be required in relation to some of the reductions. Engagement and non statutory consultation will be required with the current users, referral agencies and current providers in relation to the proposed cuts affecting other services which the Council supports.

An EAA will be required and a full report to Mayor and Cabinet will detail assessments and set out actions reduce these impacts as far as possible.

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No	Some yes and some no
---	----------------------

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No
---	----

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

All services are delivered via contracts which will require decommissioning/ recommissioning, Reductions, Negotiations

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports on the main principles returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
May 2016	Service redesign work complete and procurement begins
September 2016	Procurement processes completed
November 2016	Final service reductions and new contract values (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
March 2017	Savings implemented

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 3 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION F

Contents page

Section F: Business Support and Customer Transformation

F2: Customer Transformation Review (Phase 1) Including: Improving our online offer Pushing customers to self-serve online wherever possible	73
F3: Customer Service Centre reorganisation	77

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Customer Transformation Review (Phase 1)
Reference:	F2
LFP work strand:	Business Support and Customer Transformation
Directorate:	Public Services
Head of Service:	Ralph Wilkinson
Service/Team area:	Customer Services Centre
Cabinet portfolio:	Policy and Performance
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) improve our online offer	No	No	Yes
b) pushing customers to self-serve online wherever possible	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

As part of the Customer Service Transformation Review (strand F within the Lewisham Future Board), work is being undertaken to identify opportunities to optimise digital access channels for our high volume services and to redesign back office functions to ensure efficiency. Initially, the savings will focus on the Customer Service Centre, who currently take calls on behalf of a number of council services.

This proposal is specifically focused on the calls the Customer Service Centre take for environmental services. This includes services allowing customers to ring up and report missed bin collections, flytipping, graffiti, dead animal etc., book garden waste, lumber and mattress collections and enquire about pest control and other related services.

The second phase of the project will expand to include other services with high volumes of customer contact, for example building control and registrations.

Saving proposal

We will improve our online offer, starting with environmental services, encouraging customers to self-serve online and where appropriate withdrawing the telephone channel in favour of an online-only service. We will then be able to reduce capacity within the Contact Centre equivalent to 5 FTE (factoring in annual leave, sick days etc). We will also focus on streamlining and improving back office processes to improve our service and create efficiencies.

Having proved this concept, we will take the same approach to delivering at least £52k further savings from the other services under review by pushing customers to self-serve online wherever possible.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Customers will need to transact with the council online rather than via the call centre for specific services. The review will focus on making the online offer as efficient and easy to use as possible, so levels of service will not be affected.

Customers who might not have easy access to the internet may need additional support as a result of services moving online: this would potentially include potentially those with learning difficulties, those on low incomes, those with English as a second language or older people (although recent ONS data shows that 71% of 65-74 year olds and 33% of over 75s have used the internet in the past three months). The main impact on council staff will be on call centre staff, whose role will be necessarily reduced as customer contact shifts from phone to online contact. Full staff consultation would be undertaken.

Environmental services (and other service areas to be identified) whose customer contact is delivered through the calls centre may need to make changes to their back office processes.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that an inefficient online service will make it difficult for services to manage their processes, or that they will generate failure demand, driving up phone contact in other areas. In order to mitigate this we will ensure that the web offer is of a high standard, with services easy to find and complete. A joined up approach to digital transformation will ensure that customers transact with us online as their first choice, that requests are processed correctly the first time, and that links to back office services are fully streamlined.

We will deliver support services for those customers without the facilities or the knowledge to use online services to ensure that they are not disadvantaged by these proposals and are able to realise the benefits of being online. We will provide free internet access in libraries across the borough, supported by library staff, and are working with GoOn UK to develop targeted support to the above groups to ensure they realise the benefits of using the internet, including council services.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	2,256	(862)	1,394
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) improve our online offer	148		148
b) pushing customers to self-serve online wherever possible		52	52
Total	148	52	200
% of Net Budget	10%	4%	14%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA

5. Financial information			
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10	3	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Medium	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	NA	Pregnancy / Maternity:	NA
Gender:	NA	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	NA
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	NA
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	NA
Religion / Belief:	NA	Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
We will deliver support services for those customers without the facilities or the knowledge to use online services to ensure that they are not disadvantaged by these proposals and are able to realise the benefits of being online. We will provide free internet access in libraries across the borough, supported by library staff, and are working with GoOn UK to develop targeted support to the above groups to ensure they realise the benefits of using the internet, including council services.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	Yes
Workforce profile:	

9. Human Resources impact					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5		13.5			2 FTE
Sc 6 – SO2		2			
PO1 – PO5		5			
PO6 – PO8		1			
SMG 1 – 3		1			
JNC					
Total		22.5			2 FTE
Gender	Female	Male			
		8			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
		16			
Disability	Yes	No			
		21			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
				19	

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
TBC

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Customer Service Centre reorganisation
Reference:	F3
LFP work strand:	Public Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Ralph Wilkinson
Service/Team area:	Public Services / Customer Service Centre
Cabinet portfolio:	Policy and Performance
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) 120K	No	No	Yes
b) 53K	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Customer Service Centre delivers the corporate call centre (including switchboard), face to face service in Laurence House and the Register Office. In 2014/15 the service dealt with 160K calls to the switchboard of which approximately 70% were handled automatically, 149K calls to the call centre, 63K visitors, registering 3,965 births and 1,316 deaths, 564 marriages/civil partnerships and 1491 citizen ceremonies.
Saving proposal
a) Restructure corporate contact centre to reduce management (1FTE) and staff (3 FTE) b) Restructure register office to remove management (1FTE) plus deliver enhanced 'Tell Us Once' service online/ via DWP only.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
a) Reduce contact centre telephone performance target from 91% of calls answered to 80% answered, subject to appropriate CRM and ACD systems being in place. b) Basic 'Tell us Once' service offered only. Customers will need to go online or contact DWP to complete the enhanced service.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
None

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	2,256	(862)	1,394
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) 120	120		120
b) 53	10	43	53
c)			
d)			
Total	130	43	173
% of Net Budget	9%	3%	12%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			

8. Service equalities impact

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No	No
---	----

9. Human Resources impact (a) (CSC Management Re-structure)

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees:	Yes
--	-----

Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5	17	13.5		15.8FTE (19 staff)	2 FTE
Sc 6 – SO2	2	2			
PO1 – PO5	5	5			
PO6 – PO8	1	1			
SMG 1 – 3	1	1			
JNC					
Total	26	22.5		15.8 FTE (19 staff)	2 FTE
Gender	Female	Male			
	18	8			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	10	16	0	0	
Disability	Yes	No			
	5	21			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
	7			19	

The impact of the staff re-structure element of (a) within the Customer Service Centre will not be identified until staff consultation has been held and outcomes of any downsizing/ recruitment confirmed.

10. Human Resources impact (b) (Register Office Restructure)

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees:	Yes
--	-----

Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2	8	6.5		1	
PO1 – PO5	3	3			
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total	11	9.5		1	0
Gender	Female	Male			
	10	1			

10. Human Resources impact (b) (Register Office Restructure)					
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	3	7		1	
Disability	Yes	No			
	0	11			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
	2			9	

Delivery of 'Tell Us Once' service online/ via DWP only has no staff impact.

11. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

--

12. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September Consultation for (a) Management Restructure Transition work for (b) Tell Us Once element
October 2015	Transition work ongoing for (a) Management Restructure Transition work for (b) Tell Us Once element
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review Transition work for (b) Tell Us Once element
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December Implementation of (b) Tell Us Once element
January 2016	Implementation of (a) New Management Structure Savings implemented for (a) New Management Structure Savings implemented for (b) Tell Us Once element
February 2016	Budget set 24 th February
March 2016	Implementation of (a) staff restructure (achieved through reduction in agency staff)
April 2016	Savings implemented for (a) staff restructure
July – October 2016	Consultation for (b) Register Office Management Restructure TBC

Transition work for for (b) Register Office Management Restructure TBC
Implementation of (b) New Register Office Management Structure TBC
Savings implemented for (b) Register Office Management Restructure TBC

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 4 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION G

Contents page

Section G: Income Generation

G2: Various approaches to income generation

83

Includes: Advertising
Wireless Concessions
Regulatory restrictions and treasury management
Sundry debt collection.
Parking: Review service level arrangements.

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Various approaches to income generation
Reference:	G2
LFP work strand:	Income Generation
Directorate:	Cross-Council
Head of Service:	Selwyn Thompson (lead)
Service/Team area:	Various areas
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Advertising	N	N	N
b) Wireless concessions	N	N	N
c) Regulatory restrictions and treasury management	N	N	N
d) Sundry debtor collection	N	N	N
e) Parking income	N	Y	Y

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Council generates in excess of £100m of income from fees, charges and other service income from a variety of sources. This revenue is increasingly important with government budget reductions meaning that the Council is required to implement significant savings over the short to medium term. While income will play a critical role in meeting this challenge, it must be undertaken in a clear, transparent and consistent way.</p> <p>The guiding principle of the income generation strand is to ensure that income can be a means by which to ensure a service is sustainable in the longer term. Proposals in this summary paper suggest that officers could implement measures to generate sustainable income of £1.050m for 2016/17 and a further £0.250m in 2017/18. These proposals currently exclude the ongoing review of fees and charges. This is a significant piece of work and officers are expected to bring further proposals forward on this in due course.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>Proposal 1: Increasing advertising income £0.300m</p> <p>This proposal seeks to exploit advertisement opportunities in the borough. A recent audit of the borough was undertaken, identifying key locations where advertising would work well. It provided some reasoned indications that sustainable income of some £0.300m per annum could be achieved by a mixture of large format digital and non-digital advertising at various sites in the borough. This level of income is based on the likely guaranteed fixed rents payable to the Council and reflects assumptions</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

regarding commissions, discounts, voids and capital amortisation.

Proposal 2: Wireless concessions £0.200m

This proposal looks to implement a concession licensing arrangement for use of street furniture to install wireless networking equipment in exchange for income to the Council. This is expected to accelerate the take-up of wi-fi in areas where no or limited coverage exist. Proposals around phone mast installations are also being investigated. There are some caveats to these proposals, namely the PFI contracts that much of our street furniture is subject to. Careful legal discussions with our partners and contractors are necessary. Also there is a possibility that it may be harder to secure the levels of income in a borough without so many areas of high footfall and further investigation into the predicted costs and potential revenue would be needed. An annual target return of £0.200m would seem reasonable when benchmarked against the deals other local authorities have secured.

Proposal 3: Review of regulatory restrictions for the HRA, DSG and Capital Programme and review of treasury management £0.300m

In the latter half of 2015/16, officers will examine the regulation restrictions for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and the Capital Programme. This is to ascertain whether or not it's possible to further push the boundaries for charges to these accounts, thereby releasing general fund resources. This detailed desktop exercise has begun and a target of £0.200m on going would appear realistic for 2016/17. For treasury management, first year proposal which focused on achieving greater gains from investments on treasury management activity, this proposal looks at a comprehensive review of the long term debts the Council has to assess options for debt rescheduling and debt redemption. This proposal will be dependent upon market conditions and the willingness of counterparties to enter negotiations on revising their loan books. An annualised equivalent saving target of some £0.100m would seem realistic at this stage.

Proposal 4: Review of sundry debtor collection - estimated 'saving' (improved performance on collection) £0.250m 2016/17

A review of sundry debtor collection will be carried out in 2015/16 with a target to improve collection by at least 1% which is equivalent to £0.250m. The review, led by the Head of Public Services, will look at the end to end process for sundry debtor collection; review the use of technology and the staffing arrangements. The current arrangements are that services raise invoices and where these remain unpaid they are followed up by the central sundry debt collection team using the new Oracle system. These arrangements will be comprehensively reviewed using external expertise to ensure we have the best structure in place which is following an effective process and making the most of the technology available.

Proposal 5: Parking - review of income £0.250m 2017/18

The Council reviewed its parking policy in 2012/13. On the 10 April 2013 Mayor and Cabinet agreed 37 recommendations which led to a revised parking policy. Recommendation 10 set out that the Council would freeze parking charges at the current levels until 2015/16 and review annually thereafter. Recommendation 11 set out that the Council would consult on any future charge increases that exceeded inflation.

3. Description of service area and proposal

The Council's parking policy has to balance the needs of those living, working, visiting and trading in the borough as well as ensuring that the cost of parking controls is met. Complicating matters further is the increase in car ownership and the insatiable demand for parking spaces along with the need to reduce the harmful effects of car use on the environment. The Council's parking charges reflect the need to not only cover the costs of delivering parking controls but also managing these issues.

The parking charges are fixed in accordance with the requirements of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to use them to *'secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway'*.

Charges were set at a level which is in line with the median level in London. Setting charges at that level ensured that the borough did not become a 'car park' for those travelling into London from the south east. It also ensured the Council continued to meet the objectives set out above and comply with the requirements of Section 122 Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984.

The Council's fear of becoming a 'car park' for commuters is very real. The introduction of the congestion charge in 2003 saw the number of commuters driving into central London reduce but the risk was and remains that they park in car parks in the surrounding areas. The Council has multiple transport links into central London which makes it a very real risk. This is especially the case as Lewisham is just inside zone 2 with cheaper fares and at the end of the Docklands Light Railway. Added to this is the fact that access to Lewisham and its car parks is relatively easy for commuters driving into to London but becomes more difficult the further into London they travel as travel times' increase.

The charges were last increased in 2011. A review of the changes to maintain the arrangements detailed above will lead to an increase in income.

The parking policy review also led to a controlled parking zone programme of reviews of existing arrangements and the implementation of new zones. Whilst the review of existing zones is likely in some cases to lead to a loss of income and there is a cost of reviewing and implementing zones overall there is likely to be an increase income.

It is estimated that increased charges and the controlled parking zone programme will lead to an additional income of £0.250m.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Impact discussed above

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The key risk with all of these proposals is a failure to meet income targets as a result of a drop in service demand. This is particularly relevant to the parking proposal. Other factors to be mindful of include the economic climate, legislation or changed to government regulations. Analysis will be undertaken to model the potential impacts to mitigate risks wherever possible and the income generation project board will remain in place to keep oversight on the impact of the changes.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

--

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)			
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Advertising	300		300
b) Wireless Concessions	200		200
c) Debt Management	300		300
d) Sundry Debt Collection		250	250
e) Income	250		250
Total	1,050	250	1,300
% of Net Budget	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High		

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	

8. Service equalities impact			
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
To be reviewed by Legal Services

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 5 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION H

Contents page

Section H: Enforcement and Regulation

H2: Further reductions in Crime, Enforcement and Regulation and Environmental Health	91
--	----

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Enforcement and Regulatory services Food safety, Environmental protection
Reference:	H2
LFP work strand:	Enforcement and Regulation
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney
Service/Team area:	Crime Reduction and Supporting People
Cabinet portfolio:	Community Safety and Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer and Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Further reductions in Crime, Enforcement and Regulation and Environmental Health will be identified via a 3 month and 6 month review post implementation of the new structure (which began in Aug 15). Proposals will be brought in April 16.	Yes	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>a) A number of service areas were brought together in 2015, including Licensing, Anti Social Behaviour, Public Health and Nuisance and Trading standards. These services were remodelled with a single multi faceted staff team delivering across all of these areas. To manage the service a risk matrix model has been adopted and staff deployed to tackle persistent and significant issues.</p> <p>b) A number of services were brought together in 2015 including Food safety, Environmental Protection, Special treatment licensing and Commercial health and Safety. This service will also work on a risk based model.</p> <p>In 2015 there was a reduction of £800K across both areas met in 2015. This resulted in approximately 33% reduction in the services collectively. The new service model was implemented in Aug 15.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The New Service structure was implemented in Aug 15. The service will be reviewed 3 and 6 months post implementation to assess impact, deliverability and demand. Based on the findings of this review, a detailed demand management assessment and further exploration of alternative models, including shared services, proposals for further reductions will be made in April 16.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
<p>Without first implementing the new structure in 2015 there is no way of knowing the deliverability and risks associated with the changes. Some areas for consideration include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant risks in achieving this cut based on safety to residents in relation to food safety. • Reduced resources to tackle issues such as Anti Social Behaviour on a preventative way may result in increased demand on police, and demand on the Youth Offending Service. • Ability to deliver the Statutory functions of the Council such as licensing and public health and nuisance.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
<p>It is too early to satisfactorily consider further reductions and impact – there will be a detailed review in Nov 15 and Feb 16 to understand implications and risks. Proposals will be brought in April 16.</p>

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	3,046	(885)	2,161
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Not stated at this time	0	1,200	1,200
Total	0	1,200	1,200
% of Net Budget	0%	56%	56%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes		
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
4	3	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
N	N	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	High	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:	H	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Any further reductions will impact on the whole community. Specific victims of crime feature greatest within females.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5	33	33	37		4
PO6 – PO8	1	1	1		
SMG 1 – 3	1	1	1		
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
	15	20			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	13	22		4	
Disability	Yes	No			
	2	33			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Staff consultation will be required for changes to the current structure.

10. Legal implications

The statutory nature of many of the activities delivered by the services outlined in this report is recognised. At the heart of the proposed new delivery model is the need to ensure that the Council's statutory obligations are addressed but that we are realistic about what is really needed, about what we can deliver and that enforcement action is targeted and proportionate to the circumstances. In most cases the level of statutory activity required is not explicitly set out which implies that it is for the Council to exercise their discretion on levels of local provision.

Pursuant to s.17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1988, every local authority has a statutory "duty to ...exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area."

It is understood that as a consequence of the proposals within this report, there will be no loss of any specific statutory function; accordingly, the broad statutory obligations pursuant to the provisions of the said Crime & Disorder Act 1998 will continue to be complied with. So too, will the other relevant statutory enforcement obligations continue to be complied with by the Council consequent upon the specific proposals specified within this report.

Namely, section 6 Food Safety Act 1990, to carry out all necessary food enforcement inspections as a statutory 'food authority', (this is carried out and will continue to be carried out with the assistance of external qualified support,) the provisions of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974, in particular, Ss. 18 & 19, so as to enforce the necessary health and safety provisions as a statutory 'enforcement authority', with a necessary authorized Inspector, S. 69 and Part VI of the Weights and Measures Act 1985, S. 3 Licensing Act 2003, as a Licensing Authority for the purposes of all the Licensing Act functions and S. 2 Gambling Act 2005 when acting as a Licensing Authority for the purposes of all Gambling Act functions.

Since the meeting of the Mayor and Cabinet held on Wednesday 11th February 2015, there has been a need to expand the legal implications following a consultation response .

As a direct consequence of that said meeting and representations made thereat, an attempt is made below to address a number of further relevant statutory provisions. To be noted however, is that the following supplementary list of relevant statutory functions covered by the service areas affected, is by no means intended to be exhaustive given that the range of services covered by this proposal are so broad in nature. (By way of example only, in addition to the specific noted functions within this report both set out above and below, there are numerous others; including but not limited to, non- food consumer product safety and unfair trading practices, which the Council also has a duty to enforce'.)

All relevant functions pursuant to the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act 1984, including powers of necessary entry to premises (s. 61) as a 'relevant health protection authority' (and for the Council to be able to serve all relevant documents and notices, s. 60) also in particular, Part III of the said Act.

All relevant functions pursuant to the Health Protection (Part 2A Orders) Regulations 2010 (in the context of the said 1984 Act) and this includes the obligation to provide a written report to the national 'Public Health [England]' Office, each time a Part 2A Order is made.

10. Legal implications

All relevant functions pursuant to the Public Health Act 1961 including filthy or verminous premises.

All relevant functions pursuant to the Control of Pollution Act 1974, which are not dealt with elsewhere within the Council's enforcement services; namely, including but not limited to, the service of statutory notices and related enforcement action concerning controlling 'noise' emanating from construction sites (Ss. 60 & 61), and exercising lawful rights of entry and inspection (s. 91).

All relevant functions pursuant to the Environmental Protection Act 1990, including those within Part IIA of the Act, where necessary. For this Part of the 1990 Act, the Council is the 'enforcing authority'. This enables the authority to serve appropriate notices, so as to require and subsequently enforce remediation of contaminated land – and deal with alleged significant pollution of controlled waters. The Council must maintain a register containing prescribed particulars relating to 'remediation notices' served and action taken.

All relevant functions pursuant to the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Part III, where necessary. Here the Council's authorized officers seek to counter alleged statutory nuisances when witnessed by them, pursuant in particular sections, 79 and 80.

All relevant functions pursuant to the Clean Air Act 1993, to control in particular, smoke. Part III of the said Act is relevant to the discretionary power available to a local authority; namely the declaration of a smoke control area. Local Authorities within the provisions of this Act, have the power to obtain information about the emission of pollutants and other substances into the air, and the undertaking of relevant enforcement action if deemed necessary. This works in tandem with the Government published National Air Quality Strategy which contains policies with respect to the assessment or management of the quality of air, pursuant to s. 80 of Part IV Environment Act 1995. The functions here are linked closely with those pursuant to the Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999, s. 1 which seeks to prevent polluting activities.

All relevant functions pursuant to the said 1999 Act require Local Authorities to regulate certain types of industries so as to reduce pollution and in particular improve air quality. Certain industrial activities require Permits to be issued so as to set controls and emission standards to minimize pollution.

All relevant functions pursuant to the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975, and 1987, including in particular the inspecting and issuing of safety certificates for stands at sports grounds.

In addition to the above, it is important to note the Council's "Equalities" obligations when considering the exercise of its functions. The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

10. Legal implications

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
3. Engagement and the equality duty
4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
5. Equality information and the equality duty

The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Outline intention for further review prior to putting up options
November 2015	3 month review of the new service
February 2016	6 month review of the new service
April 2016	Options identified for consideration.

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 6 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION I

Contents page

Section I: Management and Corporate Overheads

I2: Further review of policy, governance and administration support staff Includes: Policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence Senior management support service Governance	99
I3 Reorganisation of how Complaints are managed across the Council	107
I4: Review of Strategy and Comms Includes: Review of Programmes in Strategy and Mayor and Cabinet Office Restructure of Communications after voluntary redundancies	111
I5: Commissioning and Procurement	115
I6: Insurance recharge risk premium	119
I7: Further review of financial services team	123
I8: Legal: Streamlining procurement and legal administration.	127
I9: HR: Reduction in Human Resources Support Includes: HR Support TU Secondments Graduate Scheme Social Care Training Realign Schools HR Recharges	131
I10: IT: further consolidate ICT spend across the Council and digitise committee papers. Includes: Revising infrastructure support and arrangements Contract, systems and supplies review Committee Papers: move to digital access only	135

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	policy development, support to senior management and council governance
Reference:	I2
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Barrie Neal
Service/Team area:	Policy & Governance
Cabinet portfolio:	Policy & Performance and Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence	No	No	Yes
b) senior management support service	No	No	Yes
c) governance	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>Savings on policy development, support to senior management and council governance.</p> <p><u>a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - already the subject of a 50% saving for 15/16, staff numbers were reduced in the service area saving £900,000 and the function was remodelled around a single consolidated team - the smaller and newly modelled team was launched in the middle of June 2015 - the team supports the organisation's need for policy development (including response to equalities duties), statutory publications, performance management, service redesign and intelligence - the newly formed function has begun to establish new ways of working that provide for greater economy, efficiency and effectiveness within a significantly reduced cost base - key service priorities relate to: policy development (including this year's renewal of the comprehensive equalities scheme and annual monitoring of the CES); statutory publications including the annual governance statement (AGS), comprehensive equalities scheme (CES) and annual CES review; support for the budget process and advice for service consultations and equalities analysis assessment; integration of key service areas across agencies (including social care – health integration); inspections (e.g. Ofsted and CQC inspections due this year); supporting a number of partnership boards; development and management of service related performance data,

3. Description of service area and proposal

performance management & review; service redesign for cost reduction and improved service delivery; intelligence (covering demographic trends and horizon scanning for key changes impacting on the borough)

b) senior management executive support

- executive directors and heads of service are supported by three teams of personal assistants
- cost reductions in the last year reduced the number of PAs supporting heads of service

c) governance

- supporting member decision making, scrutiny functions, member development, education appeals, civic events and international partnerships
- savings to date have impacted on staff numbers and though demand has increased with new committees to be served and the volume of governance activities increasing, these demands have been absorbed within a small staff complement with the adoption of technology, including 'modern.gov' and a bespoke software system to address the huge scale of education appeals
- pressures persist in particular in the management of education appeals and the wide range of popular civic events as well as the core responsibilities for committee management to both executive and scrutiny functions

Saving proposal

a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence £180,000 – 2017/18

The proposed saving would, subject to staff consultations mean a further reduction in posts within the recently re-organised and consolidated function. The new team's impact on establishing new ways of working and streamlining processes will be evaluated after the first full year of operation. It is therefore proposed that relevant staff consultations follow the outcome of the first year and a review targets a £180,000 salaries saving to be delivered in 2017/18.

b) senior management executive support £100,000 - 2016/17

Alongside the reduction in posts in 2015/16 the potential for further savings to come were flagged-up in staff consultations. This included the scope for further consolidation and co-location of executive support to senior managers. Further consolidation of support and co-location of more posts might provide scope for additional savings of £100,000 for 2016/17, subject to the relevant staff consultations.

c) governance £75,000 – 2017/18

The service has taken salaries savings impacting on staffing over the last two years. Any further savings proposal will, subject to staff consultations, impact again on salaries budgets and the number of posts supporting the respective governance functions. Though demand has increased with new committees to be served and the volume of governance activities increasing, these demands have been absorbed within a small staff complement with the adoption of technology, including 'modern.gov' for committee management and a bespoke software system to address

3. Description of service area and proposal

the huge scale of education appeals.

The £75,000 proposed here would impact directly on salaries budgets and therefore posts supporting the function. The savings proposal is equivalent to up to two FTE posts. Proposals for savings in 2017/18 would impact, in generally what is the lighter of the four years of the administration since the saving does depend upon a reduction in the scale of governance activities.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence

Whilst not obviously a front-line service area, significant vulnerabilities exist around: statutory publications, statutory data returns, public consultations and data management for operational services, support & advice for Equalities Analysis Assessments (EAAs) and preparations for service inspections across adult social care and children's services. Efforts to mitigate the impact of further savings need to be set against the background of 50% savings taken in the last year. It is proposed to target any additional savings at 2017/18 taking the level of savings to 60% on 2014/15 base line.

Action being taken to accommodate current savings and prepare the ground for future savings proposals includes:

- the streamlining of business processes, systems and procedures
- reducing the scale of data demands and increasing the scale at which data risks can be managed
- consultation formats and procedures being streamlined with the potential for less corporate oversight and advice to service areas
- preparedness for inspection and external scrutiny being curtailed
- possibly reviewing the frequency of partnership boards & level of support

b) senior management executive support

The saving will, subject to staff consultations, impact on the number of posts supporting senior management. Each round of savings reduces the attention that can be provided to deal with senior management communications (letters, e-mails and telephone calls); preparations of senior officers for meetings (papers and briefings); support to council complaints, agenda planning and council questions; diary management and formal note taking & reporting. The need for a greater degree of self-servicing for basic administrative needs shifts to senior management.

c) governance

The saving, subject to staff consultations, would impact directly on the available support to the respective governance functions including committee management and scrutiny reviews. To try to mitigate the effect on committee management and scrutiny, options will be evaluated for managing the balance of that impact on the following activities: committee management, scrutiny, member development, education appeals, civic events, international partnerships. The year in which the saving is

4. Impact and risks of proposal

proposed is the final year of the current administration. This final year tends to have less committee activity, a reduced number of scrutiny reviews and less member development commitments.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

- a) **policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence** – as above
- b) **senior management executive support** – as above
- c) **governance** – as above

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
a) policy, performance etc	900		900
b) senior management executive support	750	(35)	715
c) governance	600		600
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) policy, performance etc.		180	180
b) senior management executive support	100		100
c) governance		75	75
d)			
Total	100	255	355
% of Net Budget	%	%	%
a) policy, performance etc	0%	20%	20%
b) senior management executive support	14%	0%	14%
c) governance	0%	13%	13%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	yes	no	no
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local
Negative		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		economy
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people
Medium		9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. a) Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5	4	4			
PO6 – PO8	7	6.8			
SMG 1 – 3	3	3			
JNC					
Total	14	13.8			
Gender	Female	Male			
	7	7			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	4	10			

9. a) Human Resources impact					
Disability	Yes	No			
	2	0			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			
	9	5			

9. b) Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2	10	10			
PO1 – PO5	5	5			
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total	15	15			
Gender	Female	Male			
	14	1			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	7	7	1		
Disability	Yes	No			
	1				
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

9.c) Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 5 – SO2	1	1			
PO1 – PO5	5	5			
PO6 – PO8	1	1			
SMG 1 – 3	2	2			
JNC					
Total	9	9			
Gender	Female	Male			
	5	4			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	2	7			
Disability	Yes	No			
	1				

9.c) Human Resources impact

Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			
	2	7			

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The respective savings proposals will each be subject to staff consultations where appropriate and subject to the Council's Management of Change Policy.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September Draft consultation papers where relevant for 2015/16 savings
October 2015	Consultations on-going
November 2015	Consultations on-going - reports returned to Scrutiny for review where relevant
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December (if appropriate)
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Customer Transformation – casework review
Reference:	I3
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Cross council
Head of Service:	Led by Ralph Wilkinson
Service/Team area:	
Cabinet portfolio:	Policy and Performance
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Casework Review	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Council has a process in place for dealing with casework (complaints, casework and Freedom of Information Requests). There are Directorate teams in place to deal with this work as well as an Independent Adjudicator to deal with complaints that have escalated to stage 3 and Local Government Ombudsman liaison arrangements. The Council currently using the iCasework system to administer complaints.</p> <p>There are about 14 staff involved in casework administration but some have other responsibilities not covered by the review. The review will identify the exact number of staff involved.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The casework review will look at the Council’s complaints process, the staff structure in place to deal with it and the IT system used. The review will consult with all stakeholders including the Mayor, Councillors, MP’s etc.</p> <p>It is estimated that the review will deliver a saving of £50K by restructuring the staffing arrangements that deliver the casework service.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
<p>The review will focus on the early resolution to complaints and the streamlining of the process to improve (or in some cases maintain) the speed and quality of the response whilst making it more efficient.</p>
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
<p>The risk is that the outcome of the review does not achieve the objective for all stakeholders. To mitigate this the review will ensure that all the necessary input is</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal

gathered and considered in the redesign of the new process.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: (approximate)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	400		400
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	50		50
Total	50		50
% of Net Budget	13%	0%	13%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA
Yes / No	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			

8. Service equalities impact

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No		Yes
---	--	-----

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees:		Yes			
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The Council will need to ensure any new complaints process is statutorily compliant where appropriate.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review

11. Summary timetable

December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Review of Strategy and Comms
Reference:	I4
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Resources and Regen
Head of Service:	Robyn Fairman
Service/Team area:	Strategy
Cabinet portfolio:	Policy & Performance, Growth & Regeneration
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Review of Programmes in Strategy and Mayor and Cabinet Office	No	No	Yes
b) Restructure of Comms after voluntary redundancies	No	No	No – already implemented

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Programmes within Strategy include the apprenticeship programme, traineeships and the Young Mayor’s programme. The Communications Team proposal has already been implemented through the voluntary redundancy restructure.
Saving proposal
Increase the income to the team by applying for more European funding, reviewing the apprenticeship programme to suit labour market conditions, and maximising efficiencies. The Communications Team restructure has already delivered the savings through the implementation of voluntary redundancy.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
We expect to increase income and offer more apprenticeships and traineeships (circa 90 a year) in conjunction with ESF and LEP funding. We will review the operation of the apprenticeship programme- in order to achieve delivery of new programme we will have to realign roles and restructure may be necessary.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
We may be unsuccessful in winning the full amount bid for, however the LEP funding is already available. We have high success rates in winning grant.

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	2,491	(444)	2,047
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Review of Programmes in Strategy and mayors office and increasing income	150		150
b) Restructure of Comms after voluntary redundancies	60		60
Total	210		210
% of Net Budget	10%	%	10 %
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
5	2	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users –N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	

8. Service equalities impact			
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Possibly
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Review of programmes within the Strategy Division
November 2015	Consultations if required
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C

11. Summary timetable

	for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Commissioning and Procurement
Reference:	I5
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Cross Directorate
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Cross Directorate
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Commissioning and Procurement	Yes	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>Across all its services the Council spends in the region of £240m (approximately half the gross general fund spend annually) with third party suppliers. This excludes other commissioning and procurement activity undertaken for and on behalf of our partners, in particular Health.</p> <p>The scale of procurement activity ranges from small scale purchases to support service delivery up to the very large (multi-million pound) contracts for the provision of care services and capital projects. Some procurement activity is very transactional (e.g. purchasing refuse trucks) while other areas require more involved work through commissioning activities (e.g. purchasing of care packages for individuals).</p>
Saving proposal
<p>To continue the work begun in 2015/16 in respect of assessing and reducing our spend on commissioning and procurement activity – approximately £4m annually which represents a cost for securing and running these contracts of just over 1.5% – and the amount we spend with suppliers. The intention is to reduce contract spend where possible (by varying or re-letting contracts) and identify opportunities for efficiencies, better co-ordination, and streamlining of activities to achieve in the region of £1m of savings over the next two years.</p> <p>A base lining exercise of commissioning and procurement activity across the Council will be completed by the end of September. The Council's contract register has also been refreshed and moved to an online platform. This information and options will be presented to the Lewisham Future Board to enable them to consider whether a new organisation model for managing commissioning and procurement is appropriate (including potentially sharing services) or the savings are best achieved within individual services in proportion to their commissioning and procurement activity.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

There should be no impact to service users. However, with the planned £1m reduction in spend there are likely to be staff redundancies. How and where these changes will impact has not yet been finalised and will depend on the assessment of how savings are to be implemented when the base line analysis is concluded – see description of proposal.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The main risks to this proposal arise from reducing the resources available to complete the activities required. These might be that: 1) sub-optimal procurement decisions are made, or 2) that contract management does not maintain sufficient oversight and control - resulting in the Council not receiving the services it pays for or spending more on certain activities than is necessary.

The mitigations to these risks are through: the use of technology to help streamline procurement processes in line with EU procurement regulations (including new contract register and financial reporting tools in Oracle R12); the work of the Corporate Commissioning and Procurement Board to ensure the gateway approach introduced in 2014/15 continues and improves; guidance and training offered by the procurement team to facilitate the steps to achieving successful and value for money procurement; and the work of individual services to also use technology and their relationships with partners to improve efficiency and effectiveness in this area.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	4,000 est.		4,000 est.
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Commissioning and Procurement	500	500	1,000
Total	500	500	1,000
% of Net Budget	13%	12%	25%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Negative		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes*
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			

9. Human Resources impact					
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

* this will be completed when the base lining exercise is concluded and the decision taken on whether the savings are to be made through a corporate 'solution' or locally by individual services.

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Irrespective of the preferred operational arrangements, those involved in commissioning and procuring services on behalf of the Council will need to ensure they continue to comply with the EU procurement regulations as they pertain to local government.

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposal prepared (this template)
September 2015	Proposal submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Analysis of detailed baseline and implementation options to the Futures Board
November 2015	
December 2015	Staff consultations undertaken as/if necessary
January 2016	
February 2016	
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Insurance
Reference:	I6
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Insurance and Risk Management
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Insurance recharge risk premium	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Insurance and Risk ensures the Council has sufficient insurance cover (in the market or by way of reserves) and manages claims promptly and fairly to reduce the impact of risks should they materialise. The Council's insurance services are also offered to schools and housing to enable them to access the expertise and economies of scale the Council's arrangements provide.
Saving proposal
Current arrangements ensure that insurance recharges to third parties - schools via the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and housing via the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) - cover the direct (e.g. premiums) and operational (e.g. claims handling) costs for providing agreed levels of cover.
This proposal is to adjust the insurance recharge model to introduce a 'premium for risk'. The revised charges will more accurately reflect the whole risk to the Council arising from the higher levels of excess applicable to school properties and provide a contribution to the risk that the Council carries in respect of the gap between the level of risk insured (self-insured and via external premium) and the actual exposure.
This will represent income to the General Fund where the cost of insurance risk is held and an expense to each of the DSG and HRA as part of the cost to them of accessing this insurance cover.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is no direct impact to service users or staff. This proposal is about ensuring the Council has sufficiently robust and resourced insurance arrangements in place in the event of a serious incident that results in a claim against the Council.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The risks associated with the proposal are that the income is not achieved because:
 1) the offer to provide insurance services from the Council to schools and the HRA are declined; or
 2) those activities leave the Council (e.g. schools become Academies or there is a housing stock transfer).

In respect of the first the mitigation is to ensure that the insurance offer (cost and level of service) continues to compare favourably with that which is offered on the open market. There is limited mitigation for the second so the risk remains.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	4,021	(2,180)	1,841
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Insurance recharge risk premium	300		300
Total	300		300
% of Net Budget	16%	0%	16%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	Yes	Yes
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	Yes – this premium will be an increased cost (of less than one tenth of one percent) to each of the DSG and HRA.		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10	4	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposal prepared (this template)
September 2015	Proposal submitted to Scrutiny leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	
November 2015	
December 2015	Return to M&C, if decision not delegated or already taken, for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Finalise insurance recharge model for 2016/17
February 2016	
March 2016	Saving implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Finance efficiency savings
Reference:	I7
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Selwyn Thompson
Service/Team area:	Financial Services Division
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Finance non-salary budget and vacancies review	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Finance – The Council’s Finance Division provides a statutory accounting function; financial, business and management accounting advice to management as well as a payroll and pension function.
Saving proposal
There will be a review of non-salaried budgets following the recent restructure of the finance function. In addition to this, a number of staffing vacancies have been held pending a more detailed review which is planned to take place in April 2016. It is expected that a saving of £100k could be achieved in 2016/17 with minimal impact on staffing with a further £150k to follow in 2017/18.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The Finance Division will need to continue working with limited flexibility in its staffing budget to deal with workload pressures should existing workloads not be reduced or contained following the recent restructure/downsizing and further savings being delivered.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The finance function has already delivered significant revenue budget savings over the course of the last three years which has had an impact on lessening the team’s capacity. In delivering these further savings for 2016/17 and 2017/18 it will become increasingly important to ensure a more direct focus on our statutory responsibilities whilst at the same time equipping budget holders with the appropriate tools and knowledge to be more self-reliant in managing their budgets

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	5,382	(1,191)	4,191
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Finance non-salary budget and vacancies review	100	150	250
Total	100	150	250
% of Net Budget	2%	4%	6%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	N/A		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	2. Young people's achievement and involvement
Positive		3. Clean, green and liveable
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	4. Safety, security and a visible presence
Medium		5. Strengthening the local economy
		6. Decent homes for all
		7. Protection of children
		8. Caring for adults and the older people
		9. Active, healthy citizens
		10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	

8. Service equalities impact

For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:

N/A

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No

No

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No

No

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

There are no specific legal implications

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Streamlining procurement and legal administration.
Reference:	I8
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Kath Nicholson
Service/Team area:	Legal (Procurement/Administration)
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Minor reorganisation of Legal Services to incorporate Procurement function	No	No	yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The procurement team provides advice to commissioners across the Council, maintains the Council's contract register and makes reports available to central government about council procurement activity through overseeing the Council's procurement portal.
Saving proposal
The procurement function transferred to Legal in 2015. With the merging of the two functions, legal and procurement, a mini-reorganisation of administrative support will net out a £50k salaries saving.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Senior procurement practitioner posts will be recruited to minimising the impact on meeting the organisation's needs from the changes being made. However, reorganisation of the administrative support to legal/procurement will provide scope for the deletion of two posts.
The proposal should provide a more stable and resilient procurement team working closely with contract lawyers.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Inability to recruit to senior positions. External advert for procurement manager at appropriate grade

4. Impact and risks of proposal

--

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	2,160	(387)	1,773
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	50		50
Total	50		50
% of Net Budget	3%	0%	3%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	yes	no	no
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10 As procurement relates to all services, the proposal will impact on all political priorities		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	

8. Service equalities impact

For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:

Depends on outcome of reorganisation procedure and recruitment exercise

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No No

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No Yes

Workforce profile:

Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5		1			
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5		1			
PO6 – PO8					1
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
		2			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
		2			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			
		2			

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The reorganisation will follow the Council's management of change and redeployment procedures.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing

11. Summary timetable

November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in Human Resources Support
Reference:	I9
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Andreas Ghosh
Service/Team area:	Human Resources
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) HR Support	N	N	Y
b) TU Secondments	N	N	Y
c) Graduate Scheme	N	N	N
d) Social Care Training	N	N	N
e) Realign Schools HR Recharges	N	N	N

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

The Council's HR services are made up of a strategic core of staff providing industrial relations, organisation change and development and business partner support, as well as recruitment and clearance function, reorganisation support and employee advice and learning and development provision.

The division supports service to the schools in the production of people management policies, occupational health service, trade union secondments, DBS checks and industrial relations.

A substantial part of the divisions learning resource also provides adult social care learning which in turn is substantially focussed on the private and voluntary sector.

Saving proposal

- a) To reduce the provision of support to managers, including advice on employee relations, reorganisations, change management, recruitment and learning. In the process review employee support provision such as Investors in People accreditation.
- b) To review the trade union secondment arrangements to reflect a reduction in the number of Council employees.
- c) Reduce support provision available to the graduate scheme and restricting number of future graduates taken on to the current limit of 2 per annum.
- d) Reduce social care training, including that provided to the private, voluntary and independent sector, by incorporating basic training such as induction and safety

3. Description of service area and proposal	
	into the provider requirement, rationalise the number of programmes on any one subject, developing improved digital learning activity and improved attendance at classroom based programmes.
e)	Realign the HR recharges to the schools for recruitment, occupational health, policy advice, HR systems. DBS clearance, trade union secondments and employee relations.
f)	

4. Impact and risks of proposal	
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:	
The proposals will reduce the support on human resources matters to managers, as well as the Council's compliance with people management policy and objectives. The proposals will reduce the social care training support in the community which will be mitigated by increasing provider requirements on training.	
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:	
The proposals are a risk to effective employee relations and the Council's ability to act as a single employer	

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
			2,100
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Staff	20	200	220
b) Trade unions	40		40
c) Graduate support	40		40
d) Schools recharge	100		100
d) Adult social care training		100	100
Total	200	300	500
% of Net Budget	10%	15%	25%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	2. Young people's achievement and involvement
Negative		3. Clean, green and liveable
		4. Safety, security and a visible presence
		5. Strengthening the local economy
		6. Decent homes for all

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Medium		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The reduction will have an overall impact on most characteristics as HR policies and practice relate to all these characteristics. However as adult social care training is being reduced there will be a greater impact on older people.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	1				
Scale 3 – 5	2	1.5	3		
Sc 6 – SO2	10	10	11		1
PO1 – PO5	17	15.3	19	1	3
PO6 – PO8	3	3	2		
SMG 1 – 3	4	3.2	5		1
JNC	1	1	1		
Total	38		41		
Gender	Female	Male			
	30	8			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	14	23		1	
Disability	Yes	No			
	3	32		3	

9. Human Resources impact

Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

--

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	IT
Reference:	I10
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Customer services
Head of Service:	Duncan Dewhurst
Service/Team area:	Technology and Change
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Revising infrastructure support arrangements	Yes	No	Yes
b) Contract, systems and supplies review	Yes	No	No
c) Committee Papers: move to digital access only	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Technology and Change division provides IT services to the whole Council through a mixture of in-house provision and contracted services. The central IT budget is around £7m and across the Council expenditure on IT and related IT services accounts for a further £3m.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The internal IT teams were restructured last year (to deliver savings £750k agreed in 14-15). As agreed by Mayor and Cabinet the Technology and Change division is currently in the process of implementing a major upgrade of Lewisham's IT infrastructure which will provide modern, stable and flexible IT. Building on this, as part of the IT strategy, the Head of Technology and Change has reviewed the potential to make savings in other parts of the Council's budget and is proposing to make further savings of £1m in 16-17 and a further £1m in 17-18.</p> <p><u>16-17 savings</u></p> <p>The savings in 16-17 will come from two areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revising our arrangements for supporting our infrastructure (our current arrangements with Capita come to an end on April 1 2016); and - Reviewing contracts, systems and supplies to make best use of the new infrastructure.

3. Description of service area and proposal

Revising infrastructure support arrangements

As agreed by Mayor and Cabinet we are currently investigating the feasibility of setting up a shared infrastructure support service with London Borough of Brent. No further decisions are required at this stage – a final decision on whether to proceed with the shared service will need to be taken by Mayor and Cabinet later in the autumn. Nevertheless indicative financial modelling suggests that savings in the region of £0.5m pa could be feasible.

Reviewing contracts, systems and supplies

Once the new IT infrastructure is in place there will be opportunities to deliver further savings from a combination of:

- Retendering existing contracts and better supplier management
- Reducing the amount of paper the Council uses, for example through making better use of mobile devices
- Reducing the cost of replacing our desktop estate through the use of 'thin clients'
- Reducing the use of bespoke systems

As part of the IT strategy the Head of Technology and Change is currently reviewing the options for making savings in these areas and will look to put in place a plan of action to coincide with the introduction of the new infrastructure. This plan will be in line with the Council's existing strategy of getting better value for money. Mayor and Cabinet may need to take further decisions on to realise these savings – for example where new contracts need to be awarded – which will be subject to the usual decision making process.

As a result of the changes being made it may be necessary to restructure staff posts in either 16-17 and / or 17-18, which would be subject to the usual consultation process.

17-18 savings plans

17-18 savings plans are yet to be developed but it is expected that further savings could be made to contracts and through further sharing with other partners.

Electronic access to committee reports and ending of paper copies

Moving toward being a paperless council will provide the scope for significant reduction in paper and printing costs. Costs of committee papers alone could provide a reduction in printing costs of between £90,000 and £100,000. More detailed work will be undertaken to substantiate this for effecting a future saving.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

IT underpins every service that the Council delivers and is a critical function for all staff.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Electronic access to committee reports and ending of paper copies

Timing of delivery of this savings will have to be managed alongside the development of the new ICT arrangements. Therefore the risks relate to effective implementation of a stable system to support electronic access to relevant papers and for elected members access and the public access to committee papers.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Risk: migrating to new infrastructure support arrangements may take longer than expected. Mitigation: taking a decision on the future of the infrastructure support arrangements as soon as possible.

Risk: changes in our infrastructure support arrangements could put at risk the stability of key systems. Mitigation: ensuring that our new infrastructure support arrangements can deal with both the new infrastructure and existing legacy infrastructure.

Risk: reducing budgets without a clear understanding of where savings are going to come from could put at risk the smooth running of key systems. Mitigation: ensuring that there is a clear plan for delivering savings from systems, supplies and contracts before proceeding

Electronic access to committee reports and ending of paper copies

Risks will be mitigated by forward planning for the roll out of the new arrangements

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	7,947	(1,177)	6,770
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	500		500
	500		500
b) 17-18 savings		1,000	1,000
c) Paperless Cttees.	100		100
Total	1,100	1,000	2,100
% of Net Budget	16%	15%	31%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		
Level of impact on	Level of impact on	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
main priority – High / Medium / Low	second priority – High / Medium / Low	8. Caring for adults and the older people
Medium		9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	3				
Scale 3 – 5	10				
Sc 6 – SO2	6				
PO1 – PO5	19				
PO6 – PO8	4				
SMG 1 – 3	2				
JNC	1				
Total	45				
Gender	Female	Male			
	25	19			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	18	21	4		
Disability	Yes	No			
	40	3			
Sexual	Known	Not known			

9. Human Resources impact

orientation	20	23			
-------------	----	----	--	--	--

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

TBC

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared
September 2015	Overall proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Ongoing work to review contracts, systems and supplies
November 2015	Decision on shared IT infrastructure support service to go to Scrutiny and Mayor and Cabinet
December 2015	
January 2016	
February 2016	
March 2016	
April 2016	Implementation of new infrastructure support arrangements

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 7 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION J

Contents page

Section J: School Effectiveness

J2: Schools Related Services	143
Includes: Schools SLA	
Attendance and Welfare	
Schools Infrastructure	
Educational Psychologists	
Estates Management	
Free School Meals Eligibility	
Management Restructure of the Standards and Achievement team	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Schools Related Services
Reference:	J2
LFP work strand:	School Effectiveness
Directorate:	Children & Young People
Head of Service:	Alan Docksey
Service/Team area:	Standards and Achievement, Education Psychology, Attendance and Welfare, Estates Management, Pupil Support
Cabinet portfolio:	Children & Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children & Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Schools SLAs: (£100k) Introduce a 2.5% above inflation increase to the charges to schools for service level agreements.	No	No	No
b) Attendance and Welfare: (£150k) The proposal is to focus council spend on meeting statutory duties and increase the range of services that schools can receive if they pay.	Yes	No	No
c) Schools Infrastructure ICT: (£118k) Schools Strategic IT post costs to be covered by charges to schools.	No	No	No
d) Educational Psychologists: (£5k) Increase in charging for training to PVI sector.	No	No	No
e) School Estates Management: (£220k) To increase charges to schools, reduce budgets for consultancy services and management re-	No	No	Yes

2. Decision Route			
organisation.			
f) Free School Meals Eligibility Assessment: (£17k) A re-organisation to reduce costs of service	No	No	Yes
g) Standards and Achievement team: (£50k) Management re-organisation to reduce costs of service	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The services and activities being reviewed all provide support to schools in support of their responsibilities.</p> <p>The Local Authority already charges for services provided to schools with an annual income of £3.3m (2015/16). The proposals set out below would increase the level of traded services by £0.4m representing 0.2% of the totality of schools' delegated budgets.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>a) To increase the charges to schools for all existing SLAs 2.5% above rate of inflation to raise £100k in 2016/17. This would better reflect the actual cost of delivering the services.</p> <p>b) This proposal is to increase the proportion of Attendance and Welfare services traded with schools and reduce the cost of the core service. The increased income is estimated at £150k. While the attendance of vulnerable pupils would continue to be the subject of attendance casework centrally, schools would be charged for routine casework currently undertaken as part of the core service. Under this proposal, the AWS would better reflect the statutory duties of the LA and there would be greater clarity about the responsibilities of schools either to undertake the casework themselves or to pay for the LA to undertake it.</p> <p>The current council funded budget of £498k represents a cost of £19 per pupil which benchmarks against average English spending of £12 per pupil. The budget has in last two years been reduced to move towards national and local comparators and this further saving would achieve the English average benchmark.</p> <p>c) The Schools Strategic IT post to be covered by the DSG through charges to schools or to no longer provide the service. The post currently costs £118k.</p> <p>d) Increase in charges for training by Education Psychology service to PVI child care providers raising £5k.</p> <p>e) School Estates: Some savings have already been made through the voluntary</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

severance scheme releasing **£30k** not already accounted for in previous savings proposals.

It is anticipated a further efficiency of the estates team can release savings of **£190k** through greater collaboration within the Council and a reduction in provision for property consultancy fees.

f) **Free School Meals Eligibility Assessment:**

It is proposed to transfer the service to the Customer Services financial assessments team. The saving would delete the remaining GF contribution of £17k towards costs but there would still be a cost borne by the DSG. This will be achieved by the deletion of a vacant post and a change of line management.

g) **The Standards and Achievement Team** monitors the performance of schools, identifies where action is required to secure improvement and broker or provide that support to the schools requiring it. A management restructure is in process which would ensure the senior capacity required for the school improvement agenda especially for secondary schools and continue work for primary and early years while delivering savings. The re-organisation would deliver **£50k** of savings through reduction in staffing budget, with the remaining staffing/commissioning budget sufficient to meet the local authority's duties to secure improvement of schools. The reduction in staffing costs will not result in redundancies because of existing vacancies.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

General

School budgets and the dedicated schools grant have come under increasing pressure over the last few years. For 2015/16, funding allocated to schools in respect of children with special educational needs has been reduced by £2.1m to help balance the central DSG budget. The Schools Forum agreed to this change, recognising that schools had already been funded for some of these costs within their delegated budgets.

Recent publicity, nationally, has highlighted that real terms funding of schools budgets will reduce over the life of this parliament by at least 7% in real terms if the funding level per pupil stays cash frozen. Some forecasts suggest up to 12% (an analysis by the Institute of Fiscal Studies).

A 7% reduction would reduce schools' spending power across Lewisham by £17m. There are other budgetary pressures on the Dedicated Schools Grant that will need to be funded. The national rates revaluation which will take place in 2017 is expected to increase the rates bills falling to the DSG. Some of this pressure will however be eased by the continued increase in pupil numbers.

In respect of the individual proposals:

a) The increased income would represent 0.2% of the delegated budgets of schools so the impact on both take up of services and on schools budgets will be minimal.

b) There is a risk that if schools do not buy in to this, that children who have some vulnerabilities and who are not in school may be missed. However the LA's 'missing from education' procedures should mitigate this. If the service is not successful in

4. Impact and risks of proposal

securing buy back from schools, there is a risk that up to 3 FTE staff may need to be made redundant.

c) Schools not buying the Strategic IT service may make poorer decisions on renewal of their IT infrastructure and equipment.

d) The increase in training charges by EPS will not have a significant impact over 120 child care providers in the borough

e) There will be a reduced capacity to respond to major incidents across the schools estate that no one individual school could manage on its own.

f) It should be possible to maintain the free school meals eligibility service with the budget reduction of £17k

g) There will be reduction in support to schools which are good and outstanding, with a greater expectation that they are sustained and improved through school to school support.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

General

It is likely that there will come a point when schools feel the increased charges through SLAs will result in them having to purchase fewer services, a reduced level of support or reducing expenditure on other services in support of pupils' education. This will make the traded services much more sensitive to price increases than has been the case in the past.

In order to mitigate the likelihood of the increased levels of income failing to be achieved there will be consultation with schools forum on the proposals with the opportunity to influence the final shape of the proposals for the services to be charged for and the value of charges. Other mitigation for each specific proposal is set out below:

a) Consultation with schools forum

b) There is a need to ensure that schools have robust systems in place to identify vulnerable children and refer to the appropriate agencies.

c) Promotion of the IT goods and services framework contract negotiated by the Council for schools

d) n/a

e) Closer alignment of service with corporate property services and wider spread of expertise to draw upon.

f) There is a need to ensure that the close working with the free entitlement Child care provision team to ensure national objectives are being delivered. The implementation of IT solutions for the application process should assist this.

g) None significant

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund	5,844	(3,670)	2,174
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Schools SLAs	100		100
b) Attendance and Welfare	150		150
c) Schools Infrastructure ICT	60	58	118
d) Educational Psychologists	5		5
e) School Estates Management	220		220
f) Free School Meals Eligibility Assessment	17		17
g) Standards and Achievement team	50		50
Total	602	58	660
% of Net GF Budget	28%	2%	30%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	Yes	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	The DSG provides additional support to these services £634k.		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
2	10	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	Other than deletion of vacant posts - No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>Section 443 of the Education Act 1996 requires local authorities to make arrangements to enable them to establish (as far as possible) the identity of children in their area who are not receiving a suitable education. Section 444 imposes a statutory responsibility of local authorities to ensure that parents fulfil their legal duty that children of compulsory school age receive suitable, efficient full-time education either by regularly attending school or otherwise. Section 446 of the Education Act 1996 requires that proceedings for offences under sections 443 or 444 can only be instituted by a local authority.</p> <p>The local authority is statutorily required to ensure that its education and training functions are exercised with a view to promoting high standards, fulfilment of potential and fair access to opportunity for education and training. The proposals have to be consistent with the local authorities ability to meet its statutory responsibilities.</p>

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations with Schools Forum 1 October 2015
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review

11. Summary timetable

December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 8 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION K

Contents page

Section K: Drugs and Alcohol Service

K4: Public Health – Drug and Alcohol Services

153

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Public Health – Drug and Alcohol Services
Reference:	K4
LFP work strand:	Crime reduction/ Drug and Alcohol Services
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Danny Ruta / Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney
Service/Team area:	Public Health
Cabinet portfolio:	Community Safety and Equalities
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities / Safer Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) reduction in budget across a range of services	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>LB Lewisham currently delivers and commissions a range of services to meet the needs of those with a drug and/or alcohol problem and to reduce harm to society as a whole.</p> <p>The service works to align with the ambition of Public Health England (PHE) to reduce health inequalities and the Government's Drug and Alcohol Strategies to increase the number of individuals recovering from addiction. It works to reduce drug and alcohol related offending as it is well demonstrated that cessation of drug use reduces re-offending significantly. This in turn will have benefits to a range of wider services and will help reduce harm in local communities.</p> <p>The National Drug Strategy 2010 puts a key focus on recovery. Whilst recognising that recovering from dependent substance misuse is an individual person-centred journey, there are high aspirations for increasing recovery outcomes. Drug and alcohol recovery systems are increasingly being geared towards the achievement of the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freedom from dependence on drugs or alcohol • Prevention of drug related deaths and blood borne viruses • A reduction in crime and re-offending • Sustained employment • The ability to access and sustain suitable accommodation • Improvement in mental and physical health and wellbeing • Improved relationships with family members, partners and friends • The capacity to be an effective and caring parent
Saving proposal
<p>An overall saving of £390,000 will be delivered by 2017/18 through a combination of demand management and service reductions.</p> <p>In 2016/17 £50,000 saving will be delivered through reducing the length of time that</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

methadone (Heroin substitute) is prescribed for consumption under supervision and the reducing costs related to needle exchange provision. The supervision of methadone consumption is designed to reduce risk of overdose and promote recovery but it is considered possible to reduce costs through greater monitoring and personalised prescriptions rather than a standard 12 week prescription.

The remaining £340,000 will be delivered by March 2017 through the re-procurement of the main drug and alcohol service (currently provided through CRI) and through greater use of community rehabilitation (rather than expensive residential services).

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The overall reduction of investment may lead to the introduction waiting time for services. This is due to the cumulative effect of year on year funding reductions since 2012.

The reduction in capacity may also mean that drug and alcohol services are less able to respond to specific requests from the council and partners e.g. the provision of outreach services to drug/alcohol hotspots e.g. street drinking areas.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

If people are unable to access treatment for their drug and/or alcohol problems it is likely to lead them to continue to engage in harmful and/or illegal activity.

This will impact on their health and may lead to increased levels of crime and anti-social behaviour.

These potential impacts will be mitigated through a focus on triaging patients to ensure those with most acute need have rapid access to services and through working with GP surgeries to focus on universally delivered preventative services.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	4,903	(511)	4,392
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	50	340	390
Total	50	340	390
% of Net Budget	1%	8%	9%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	n/a		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
9	4	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	H	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L
Gender:	H	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	NA	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:	NA	Overall:	H
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>Men are over-represented within the Lewisham treatment system, as are those from a white background and those aged between 25 and 50 so these groups are likely to be disproportionately affected by any changes in the treatment system.</p> <p>An EAA will be required as part of the procurement of the new services and a full report to Mayor and Cabinet will detail the actions undertaken to reduce these impacts as far as possible.</p>			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

All services are delivered via contracts which will require decommissioning/
recommissioning, reductions, negotiations

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	£50,000 savings implemented
May 2016	Tender process for new services begin
October 2016	Mayor and Cabinet report seeking permission for letting of the new contracts
March 2017	£340,000 savings implemented

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 9 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION L

Contents page

Section L: Culture and Community Services

L5: Main grant funding to the voluntary sector	159
L6: Libraries and Information Service	163
Draft: Consultation: Proposed changes to Library and Information Service	169
L7: Leisure Service	179

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Main grant funding to the voluntary sector
Reference:	L5
LFP work strand:	Culture and Community Services
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Liz Dart/James Lee (job share)
Service/Team area:	Culture and Community Development
Cabinet portfolio:	Third Sector & Community
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Reduction in main grant funding to the voluntary sector	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>a) Reduction in main grant funding to the voluntary sector</p> <p>LB Lewisham currently provides £3.9m in annual grant funding to the voluntary sector to deliver a range of services and activities.</p> <p>The funding is currently provided to 65 organisations and covers a range of provision including information and advice (e.g. Citizens Advice Bureau, 170 Project), Community development and support (e.g. Community Connections, Lee Green Lives), Arts and Cultural services (e.g. the Albany, Lewisham Youth Theatre), services for vulnerable people (e.g. Deptford Reach, Mencap) and Sports Development (e.g. Lewisham Thunder, Saxon Crown Swimming Club).</p>
Saving proposal
<p>Reduction in main grant funding to the voluntary sector</p> <p>Reduces the level of funding available by £1,000,000 from 1 April 2017. This is the final year of the current main grants programme and will require the reduction/removal of funding from a range of organisations currently receiving funding.</p> <p>A full consultation will be required due to the terms of the Compact and commitments made during the letting of the current grants programme.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
<p>Reduction in main grant funding to the voluntary sector</p> <p>A reduction in funding for local organisations will reduce direct service provision as the</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal

vast majority of this funding goes directly into frontline delivery.

The impact of this reduction will depend on how the cut is allocated e.g. it could be pro-rata across all groups or focused on a particular sector (e.g. Arts or Advice). This decision will need to be informed by consultation. It also needs to be considered that some activity could not easily absorb a pro-rata cut (i.e. the funding pays for a single post and would not be sustainable if reduced by 20%).

A high profile consultation is likely to generate considerable public interest and significant lobbying of local members and MPs.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
Main Grants	3,900	0	3,900
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Reduction in main grant funding to the voluntary sector	0	1,000	1,000
Total	0	1,000	1,000
% of Net Budget	0%	26%	26%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
1	8	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Medium	

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Possible specific impact in one or more
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Reduction in grant funding to the voluntary sector

7. Ward impact

	The exact impact will depend on the groups that are affected. This would only be determined following consultation.
--	---

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	NA	Pregnancy / Maternity:	NA
Gender:	NA	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	NA
Age:	High	Sexual orientation:	NA
Disability:	High	Gender reassignment:	NA
Religion / Belief:	NA	Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>It is not possible to fully assess the impact of the savings ahead of the consultation on the grants programme as the impact will depend entirely on which groups are identified to lose to funding.</p> <p>However, given the profile of the currently funded groups it is likely that older people and those with disabilities will be negatively affected by this reduction in funding.</p>			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required:			Yes

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees:	No
--	----

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
TBC

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
April 2016	Begin full public consultation on Grants reductions

11. Summary timetable

July 2016	Report on outcome of Grants consultation
October 2016	Detailed proposals on Grants reductions to Mayor and Cabinet
March 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Library & Information Service
Reference:	L6
LFP work strand:	Culture and Community Services
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Liz Dart
Service/Team area:	Library & Information Service
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Library & Information Service	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>Library & Information Service</p> <p>The Service delivers the Local Authority’s statutory duties under the Public Library and Museums Act 1964, to deliver a “comprehensive and efficient” library service to the residents of Lewisham.</p> <p>The Service operates from 7 buildings that the council manage and staff, and from 6 buildings that the council does not manage or staff (Community Libraries). The latter buildings operate through a self-service solution remotely managed by the Service, a Community Engagement Team, and the support of Community Organisations that signed up to “promoting books and reading” in 2011.</p> <p>The Community Engagement Team also includes the Home Library Service that serves residents who cannot visit a library building. The Service also includes the Archives and the Local History Service.</p> <p>Beyond traditional services – borrowing of books, reading promotions, information services – libraries provide room hire, computers and apple macs, wifi, digital content (newspapers, magazines, reference material), eAdmissions, parking permits, and registrar services.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>Library & Information Service</p> <p>The proposal which is more fully described in the draft consultation paper for Lewisham Libraries is based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. creation of three Hub Libraries – Deptford Lounge, Lewisham and Downham Health & Leisure Centre – which will carry an enhanced role for face to face contact between the Local Authority and the public to support the digital by default agenda.. 2. the extension of the Lewisham Community Library Model to Forest Hill, Torridon, and Manor House, in partnership with other council services and community

3. Description of service area and proposal

organisations. And the integration of the library provision into the repurposed ground floor space within the Catford complex (Laurence House).

3. the regrading of front line staff to include new functions through the re-training and enhancement of front line roles.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Library & Information Service

1. Service Users
The proposal may result in a negative impact for some residents where services at their local library may change. However, new community partnerships may bring new services that do not currently exist to the affected neighbourhoods.
2. Partners
The proposal brings opportunities to develop new partnerships for the library service and will provide partner organisations with access to new premises and additional service users.
3. Other Council Services
The review of staff functions may have an impact on colleagues and the delivery of their services, e.g. eAdmissions, parking services, registrar etc.
4. Staff
There will be a full staff reorganisation and some staff will be made redundant

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

1. The Local Authority may be challenged by DCMS and ACE to demonstrate how it will continue to provide the statutory “comprehensive and efficient” library service to residents.
Lewisham has run the Community Library Model since May 2011. The model is both replicable and scalable. It can be argued that the extension of the model will in fact enhance the service overall by extending opening hours at the largest branches while maintaining a library offer at the new Community Libraries.
2. The Local Authority may face legal challenges from local residents and library campaigners. The council will ensure that the decision making process is sound and that adequate consultation has taken place.
3. There is a risk that suitable partner organisations cannot be identified. The service will be flexible and adaptable in looking for partners in order to give the greatest chance of success.
4. The proposal will be challenged by staff at risk of redundancy. The council’s Managing Change Policy will be followed to ensure that staff are fully consulted and treated fairly and in accordance with the council’s HR policies.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	4,772	(552)	4,220
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000

5. Financial information			
LIS – Employee costs	400	400	800
LIS – Supplies and Services	0	100	100
LIS – Other efficiencies	0	50	50
Deptford Lounge – efficiencies	0	50	50
Total	400	600	1,000
% of Net Budget	9%	15%	24%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people’s achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
9	1	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Medium	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Forest Hill, Rushey Green, Catford South and Lee Green
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
Library & Information Service The impact is borough wide, with more acute initial impact in the wards where a library is proposed to be changed to a community library.	

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			

8. Service equalities impact

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No Yes

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No TBC

Workforce profile:

Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishm ent posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

See Point 4 (Impacts and Risks)

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Draft strategy for library consultation.
September 2015	Presentation of this paper and strategy to SSSC. Consultation starts with public meeting and presentation of the strategy and consultation vehicles
October 2015	Soft market test for partner organisations for buildings

11. Summary timetable

	proposed to move to Community Library model	
November 2015	Public consultation ends	
December 2015	Result of Consultation and Market Test to SSSC	
January 2016	Ratification of strategy and mandate to tender to Mayor & Cabinet	Staff consultation starts
February 2016	Tender documents issued	
March 2016		
April 2016	Results of tender	Staff consultation ends
May 2016	Partners appointed	Recruitment
June 2016		
July 2016	Mobilisation	Reorganisation implemented
August 2016	New model implemented	
September 2016		
October 2016		



DRAFT

London Borough of
Lewisham

**Consultation: Proposed
changes to Library and
Information Service**

September 2015

Libraries and Information Service
2nd Floor, Laurence House
1 Catford Road, London SE6 4RU
library.consultation@lewisham.gov.uk

Part 1 – About this Consultation

Topic of this consultation

1. This consultation is asking for your views on a proposal, outlined in this paper, to change the way in which the council provides library services.

Audience

2. The consultation is aimed at Lewisham residents whether current library users or not. We are also interested in hearing from other organisations that may be impacted by our proposed changes.

Duration

3. The consultation will be open from 1 October 2015 until 12 November 2015, this is the deadline for responses.

How to Respond

4. There are several ways to respond to this consultation:
 - By e-mail to:
library.consultation@lewisham.gov.uk
 - By post to:
Libraries and Information Service
2nd Floor, Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, London SE6 4RU
 - By attending a consultation meeting

There will be consultation meetings on:

Date	Time	Location
		To be announced
		To be announced
		To be announced
		To be announced
		To be announced

After the Consultation

5. Once the consultation has closed all responses will be considered and a summary of responses will be included in a report going to the meeting of Mayor and Cabinet on 9 December 2015. This report will seek a decision on the future plan for library services and approval to proceed with implementation.

Part 2 – Background

Background

6. Lewisham believes in the fundamental role that the public library service and the library buildings play as a bridge between the local authority and its residents, as public spaces that encourage communities to get together, and as portals to information, learning, and culture.
7. In the period 2010 to 2015 the council made savings of over £120 million. The council needs to identify a further £45million savings over the next 2 years to 2017/18. For this reason the council has been undertaking a fundamental review of all its budgets, including the Library and Information Service.
8. The Lewisham Library and Information Service is one of the most successful library services in London and has often performed against national trends, attracting increasing numbers of users, extending both opening hours and geographical reach, and presenting a unique and successful way of engaging with local communities.
9. The service operates through 7 buildings that the council owns and manages (Catford, Deptford, Downham, Forest Hill, Lewisham, Manor House and Torridon Road) and through 6 buildings that are owned and/or managed by third-sector organisations (Blackheath, Crofton Park, Grove Park, New Cross, Sydenham, and Pepys). In the buildings that are run by others, the service is run on a peripatetic basis, fundamentally relying on a self-service infrastructure. The Lewisham Model is different from other “community library” solutions in that the council owns and manages the stock and the systems that allow residents to access the library service. The library service that is delivered in partnership with the community libraries is therefore fully integrated with the rest of the service. The service also includes the Home Library Service that supports residents who cannot visit a library building, the Archives, and the Local History Service
10. Beyond traditional services such as borrowing of books, reading promotions, information services, the Library & Information Service provides room hire, access to computers and Apple Macs, Wi-Fi, a vast collection of digital content (newspapers, magazines, reference material), and support to eAdmissions, parking permits, and registrar services.

2014 – 2015

- Over 2,115,000 visits
41.2% higher than in 2004-05
- Over 764,000 issues
39.3% less than in 2004-05
- Libraries open 34,814 hours per year
60% higher than in 2004-05
- 5 libraries open on Sundays
- 82,445 residents (29%) are active users
62% more than in 2004-05
- Lewisham gifts books to 100% of under 5s
- Libraries cost £1.07 /month per resident

Budget	Budget 2015-2016	Net Exp
Expenditure		
Employees	£3,105,800	79.7%
Premises	£100,500	2.7%
Transport	£23,000	0.6%
Supplies & Services	£666,500	18.2%
Gross Expenditure	£3,895,800	
Gross Income	-£237,700	
Net Expenditure	£3,658,100	

Rationale for changing the library service

11. The Mayoral Commission on Libraries and Adult Learning that was published in 2009 set some principles that hold true today. Mainly they define this statutory service as the one that offers “unbiased access to information and works of the creative imagination” and one that relies on open, trusted, public spaces available to citizens. From this, two concepts are critical to interpret the function of the service:
 - a) the first pertains to the public library “service”. This is the function that interprets the right – enshrined in law – to access books (and other services) free at the point of use. The way in which this is delivered should be “comprehensive and efficient” to satisfy the law governing the service.
 - b) the second pertains to the public library “space”, the buildings that are interpreted and experienced as libraries by the public. These play a critical role in people’s lives.
12. Lewisham’s approach to the delivery of Library and Information Services embraces these principles, and the changes to the service implemented in 2011 with the introduction of community libraries were shaped by them.
13. Among others, there are now three compelling drivers that require the service to take the changes further:
 - a) The expectation of 24/7 online service provision
 - b) The need to sustain quality and reach, while serving a growing and changing population
 - c) The continued pressure on the council to reduce expenditure.
14. Online service provision

Our lives are increasingly reliant on web-based resources and services that are available 24/7. The council itself, responding to changing customer behaviours and expectations, is increasingly moving services online.

However, there is a clear recognition both in the value of face to face interaction and in the need to provide for those who – for whatever reason – may feel the need to seek support in accessing or interpreting online resources.
15. Library staff are particularly skilled in providing this support. Since the late 90s public libraries have offered free access to computers, training, and support for information seekers, learners, and more. Lewisham libraries are at the forefront of this provision, offering PCs, Apple Macs, Wi-Fi, and online collections of reference materials, eBooks, eAudio books, substantial collections of online magazines and newspapers, and Access to Research papers.
16. In developing proposals for the future delivery of the service it is important to maintain the service ability to expand the digital presence and equip staff with even better skills to support the move to digital in years to come.
17. Changing demographics

Lewisham’s resident population is due to grow steadily. For this reason, the Library and Information Service has increased its geographical reach through a Community Engagement Team, the increase in number of venues where library services can be accessed from, and the investment in digital resources. Indeed, the Service is working to develop a new and additional library presence in the Ladywell Pop-Up development. In developing proposals for the future delivery of the service it is important to build on this success.

18. Budget Pressures

The library service has been asked to identify savings of £1million to contribute to the minimum requirement of £45million that the council needs to find over the next 2 financial years. For this reason when developing proposals for the future delivery of the service it is important to substantially reduce the net expenditure budget.

Part 3 – Possible Options

19. In considering how to deliver the Library and Information Service in the future, the council has looked at a number of options:

20. **We could outsource the service and commission a third party to deliver the service** – tender the delivery of library and information services and seek a third party to run the service on a contract basis. For options linked to this approach please look at the FAQ.

Pros: A tried and tested option that other Local Authorities have adopted. A new external provider could bring new skills and capacity to the service.

Cons: This approach alone is unlikely to deliver the scale of savings required as staff costs would be transferred to the new provider as part of TUPE legislation. The ability for the service to operate as the main interface between the council and residents, supporting the digital by default agenda, may be compromised.

Given the uncertainty of the level of saving that this approach could deliver and the compromise in terms of links to the digital by default agenda, this option has been dismissed.

21. **We could reduce the opening hours of libraries or close some branches** – look at reducing costs through operating from less buildings and/or reducing opening hours.

Pros: Could deliver the required level of saving.

Cons: This option is not in line with the principles of the 2009 Mayoral Commission and would not sustain the service reach or enhance its capacity to support the digital by default agenda.

Whilst this option could deliver the required level of saving it does not meet the proposed principles and other drivers for change described in Section 2 of this paper and this option has been dismissed.

22. **We could further extend the Lewisham Model, building on the success of the community libraries** – the proposal would be to extend the model by:

- a. Establishing three hub libraries at Deptford Lounge, Lewisham and Downham Health and Leisure Centre. These hubs would carry an enhanced role for face to face contact between the Local Authority and the public, while supporting the digital by default agenda. A reorganisation of the staff and new roles would deliver increased opening hours, allowing the three hubs to be open 85 hours per week each, taking Lewisham and Downham to the level of Deptford. These three libraries are the most popular with very large numbers of visitors every month.

- b. Extending the Lewisham Community Library Model to Forest Hill, Torridon Road and Manor House and integrating the library provision into a repurposed ground floor space within the Catford Complex at Laurence House.
 These would become self service libraries and would operate in a very similar way to the current community libraries. There would be a full staff reorganisation of the service and library staff would be withdrawn from these buildings prior to the move to the community library model.
 Potential partner organisations will be asked to express an interest in occupying Forest Hill, Manor House and Torridon Road library buildings on the basis that they work with the service to support the continued provision of library services as well as providing other community benefits.
 In Catford a self service library provision will be supported by the other council staff that operate from the ground floor.

Pros: This approach would deliver the required £1M savings through a reduction of £800k to staff salaries budget, £150k from contract efficiencies in the service, and £50k efficiencies from the Deptford Lounge premises budget.
 This approach safeguards the fundamental principles that the Mayoral Commission identified for the library service while continuing to deliver cost effective, quality library services to Lewisham residents and supporting the digital by default agenda.

Cons: The proposal is reliant on identifying suitable partner organisations for three buildings.
 The service offer at the four self service libraries will change, although this may be mitigated by new services provided by the partner organisations.

On balance we believe that extending the Lewisham Library Model is the best way to continue to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service within reducing resources, and it is upon this approach that we seek your views.

Part 4 – Key Dates

23. Key dates:

1 October 2015	Consultation opens
12 November 2015	Consultation closes
30 November 2015	Outcome of consultation considered by Safer Stronger Select Committee
9 December 2015	Outcome of consultation reported to Mayor and Cabinet and decision sought on future approach for the service.
January 2016	Implementation of new approach commences including staff consultation and tendering for partner organisations.
August 2016	New approach fully implemented.

Part 5 – Consultation Questions

24. We are happy to receive responses to this consultation in any format and we are particularly keen to hear your views on the following:
- a. The council is committed to delivering a comprehensive and efficient library service that moves with the times. Our rationale for continuing to develop this is laid out in paragraphs 11 – 18 above.
Do you agree that developing the public library service is important?
Is there anything missing from the rationale?
 - b. Within this document you can see that we have described and then dismissed two approaches (paragraphs 20 and 21 above).
Do you agree with our reasoning?
Are there any other options that we should have considered?
 - c. We are undertaking an equalities assessment of the proposed methodology.
Do you feel that the proposed changes would have a negative or positive impact on Lewisham residents on the basis of their race, gender, faith/religious belief, disability, age, sexual orientation, gender assignment or marital status?
Please provide comments on the impact you feel the proposed methodology could have, which groups you feel may be affected and any action you feel we could take to mitigate any potentially negative impact.
 - d. Do you have any other views on the content of this consultation paper, not covered above?

Part 6 – Frequently Asked Questions

25. Is Lewisham closing four libraries?

No. The suggested approach which is the object of this consultation – described in paragraph 22 – is based on the four library buildings continuing to provide library services, but on the basis of the existing Community Libraries.

26. What will happen to my library?

Deptford Lounge

Very little will change at the Lounge, which is still the most successful library in Lewisham.

Lewisham

Opening hours will increase to match Deptford Lounge.

The proposal will also require some improvements to the building, including the lift and other minor adjustments.

Downham

Opening hours will increase to match Deptford Lounge.

Catford

The library space will operate on a self-service basis, while other council services are integrated across the whole ground floor of Laurence House. The integration work will be developed with Lewisham's Customer Services department.

Forest Hill, Manor House, and Torridon Road

A soft market test will seek partners willing to manage the space while supporting the provision of library services in the building.

We would expect the opening hours to remain unchanged and the floor space of the library may reduce where other activities are being developed by the partner organisation. The partners are likely to be different to reflect the different potential uses of the three sites.

27. Blackheath, Crofton Park, Grove Park, Sydenham, and New Cross

The existing community libraries will continue to operate as at present.

28. How do Community Libraries work in Lewisham?

The Community Library is a service delivered in partnership with others in buildings that used to be wholly managed by the council or in buildings owned outright by the partner organisation.

The council is responsible for buying the books, maintaining the stock, providing self-service terminals, for organising reading events, and for supporting the partner organisation with training.

Residents can still join the library service, reserve a book, borrow and return books, ask for information, and more.

29. What will happen to library staff?

There will be a full reorganisation of the service with the introduction of new, enhanced front line roles. This will see a reduction to the number of library staff. The reorganisation will be based on all remaining staff being moved to the hub libraries before the proposed extension of the community library model to the four buildings.

30. What options are there to outsource the library service?

These depend very much on the drivers that inform the choice to outsource. What follows is not an exhaustive list, but may offer a few examples of what is possible.

- a. If the driver for shared services is **securing significant staff engagement** in the ownership, leadership, and design of the library service an **employee owned social enterprise** may be the way forward.
- b. If the driver is securing **direct library user engagement** in the leadership, design, and delivery of the service a **mutual or co-operative** model may be appropriate.
- c. If the driver is achieving commercial financial discipline and a **business focus** a **local authority trading company** may be appropriate. (Essex / Slough)
- d. If the driver is **managing and developing libraries as community assets over the long term** a **charitable trust** may be appropriate (Wigan, Salford, Luton, Greenwich, although these are leisure trusts that also run libraries).
- e. If the driver is **transferring risk and decision-making** to the private sector, (joint) procurement of an **independent provider** may be appropriate (e.g. Wandsworth/Croydon, Bexley/Bromley).
- f. If the driver is **securing economies of scale** in management and service delivery **cross-borough collaboration** may be appropriate.

It would be possible to consider any of the above at a future date for the newly reconfigured service.

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Leisure Services
Reference:	L7
LFP work strand:	Culture and Community Services
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Liz Dart/James Lee (job share)
Service/Team area:	Culture and Community Development
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services</p> <p>LB Lewisham currently contract with two providers, Fusion and 1 Life, to deliver leisure services within council owned facilities.</p> <p>Fusion operate 9 sites across the borough including 6 leisure centres, 1 athletics track, 1 playing field and 1 school sports facility while 1 Life deliver services from the PFI Health and Leisure Centre in Downham. See full details and locations in section 8.</p> <p>The Fusion contract commenced on 15 October 2011 with immediate transfer of The Bridge Leisure Centre, Ladywell Arena, Ladywell Leisure Centre and Wavelengths Leisure Centre. The contract length is 15 years.</p> <p>In addition to these leisure centres, previously managed by Parkwood Leisure, the contract has since included the new centre on Loampit Vale (Glass Mill), Forest Hill Pools, Forest Hill School Sports Centre and the Warren Avenue playing fields. Bellingham Leisure and Lifestyles Centre finally transferred to Fusion 1st February 2014 when GLL pulled out of the contract to run the centre.</p> <p>Downham Health & Leisure Centre opened in March 2007, and is managed by 1Life operating through an Industrial and Provident Society (IPS) or trust, Downham Lifestyles Limited. 1Life have a 32 year contract through a PFI.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services</p> <p>This will give the leisure operators more freedom in the delivery of services in return for the reduction in subsidy to the contract and, where possible, the paying of a fee. This is likely to include the granting of 'long-lease' arrangements.</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

The ability to generate savings in this way is limited by a number of factors including the PFI arrangement at Downham and the position/condition of several of the sites in the leisure portfolio.

The budget remaining following the reduction will cover the costs of the PFI at Downham and major landlord liabilities.

The overall examination of the leisure provision in line with a range of related services such as parks, physical activity programmes, sports grants etc may lead to a more effective and joined up service offer across the borough. This could include some of the sites being removed from the Fusion contract and dealt with on a stand-alone basis or as part of a broader approach to parks, leisure services and local sports clubs.

NB – a separate savings proposal within Public Health suggests the ending of free swimming provision.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services

LBL's ability to dictate terms in relation to the day to day operation of leisure services will be reduced.

This may lead to price increases across sites (although this is likely to be limited by market forces/demographics), limited concession rates, changes in leisure programmes (e.g. the loss of less marketable classes) and less favourable terms for local clubs using the facilities.

Less accessible/affordable leisure provision is likely to impact on a range of Public Health outcomes including obesity levels, prevalence of diabetes/COPD etc although this is very difficult to quantify.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
Leisure services	3,852	(1,664)	2,188
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services	0	1,000	1,000
Total	0	1,000	1,000
% of Net Budget	0%	46%	46%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
If impact on DSG or	Yes	No	No

5. Financial information

HRA describe:

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
9	3	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Low	

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	<p>Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services</p> <p>While the impact is borough wide it is likely to be felt most acutely in the wards were there are currently leisure facilities which may be subject to change.</p> <p>Bellingham - Bellingham Leisure & Lifestyle Centre Downham - Downham Health and Leisure Centre Forest Hill - Forest Hill Pools Perry Vale - Forest Hill School Sports Centre Lewisham Central - Glass Mill Leisure Centre Rushey Green - Ladywell Arena Bellingham - Lewisham Indoor Bowls Centre Bellingham - The Bridge Leisure Centre New Cross - Wavelengths Leisure Centre Outside of Borough/Downham - Warren Avenue Playing Fields</p>

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	NA	Pregnancy / Maternity:	NA
Gender:	NA	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	NA
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	NA

8. Service equalities impact

Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	NA
Religion / Belief:	NA	Overall:	NA

For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:

It is difficult to fully assess the impact of the proposals as it will depend on the final offer which will be determined following the conclusion of current contract negotiations and possible tender activity.

However, given that the savings are likely to limit the level of subsidy available for certain groups it is anticipated that people at either end of the age spectrum (i.e. those least able to pay full price for activities) and those with disabilities (for whom specialist classes may not be financial viable) are likely to be adversely affected.

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required:	Yes
--	-----

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees:	No
--	----

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

TBC

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Detailed contractual negotiations related to leisure contracts begin
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Begin leisure procurement exercise (if required)
April 2016	Begin full public consultation on proposals (if required)
July 2016	Report on outcome of consultation (if required)
October 2016	Detailed proposals on new leisure contracts to Mayor and Cabinet
March 2017	Savings implemented

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 10 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION M

Contents page

Section M: Housing and non HRA funded services

M2: Housing Services: Strategy and Development

185

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Housing Services: Strategy and Development
Reference:	M2
LFP work strand:	Strategic Housing
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Genevieve Macklin
Service/Team area:	Housing Strategy & Programmes; Housing Needs
Cabinet portfolio:	Housing
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Housing

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Review of funding streams across housing strategy, development and partnership functions	No	No	Yes
b) Reduction in premises costs	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Housing Strategy and Programmes team co-ordinates the Council's strategic housing partnerships; enables affordable housing development among housing association partners; clients the Council's housing management contracts with Lewisham Homes and Regenter B3; programme manages the new-build housing programmes delivered by Lewisham Homes and other partners; leads on larger housing-led regeneration programmes.</p> <p>The Housing Needs team leads on homelessness assessment and prevention, across both families and single homeless client groups; manages temporary accommodation and allocations and moves of homeless families within that accommodation; manages the allocation of social housing across the borough including the administration of Homesearch.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>a) To review the funding arrangements for the staffing element of the Strategy and Programmes team budget. The team was restructured in September 2014, in light of major strategic changes including the demand for new home building and reforms to the HRA. Since that time the work of the team has focussed to very large extent on large-scale capital programmes, as well as supporting new affordable housing delivery among partners. As a result it is now proposed to review the funding of the team, specifically looking at the contribution made to staffing costs made by the capital projects that the team leads on. In addition further savings may be enabled by funding specific staff from other funding streams, including the Housing Revenue Account and S106 funds</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

- b) To make savings on premises costs by reducing the number of buildings used to provide services. As a result of smarter working and the co-location of staff the Single Homelessness Intervention Project (SHIP) no longer needs a separate operational base at Winslade Way, and instead is able to operate out of Eros House with other housing services.

c)

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

- a) There will be no impact from this proposal for service users, staff or other council services. The number of posts will remain the same, and the focus of the team will remain the same. The change simply relates to the funding streams used to meet the salary budget.
- b) This change has already taken place. Service users still have access to front line services, although these are in a different location. There are positive operational benefits from co-locating housing services in Eros House and not having a "satellite" office located away from other services.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

As above, there are no negative impacts from this proposal, other than the need for SHIP service users to access front line services at a different location, however this change has already been made and there have been no negative impacts reported.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	22,909	(19,072)	3,837
HRA	914		
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Review of funding streams across housing strategy, development and partnership functions	140	0	140
b) Reduction in premises costs	60	0	60
Total	200	0	200
% of Net Budget	5%	0%	5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	Yes
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	Cost pressure of £6k on HRA		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
6	3	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
NA	NA	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 11 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION N

Contents page

Section N: Environmental Services

N3: Waste: Variety of changes	191
N4: Cease Routine Residential Road Sweeping	199
N5: Review of Lewisham’s Fleet and Passenger Transport Service	205
N6: Other Environment Savings & Income	211

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Waste Review (Collection / Disposal)
Reference:	N3
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
1 Review of Lewisham's Waste Services (Doorstep collection & disposal)	Yes	Yes	Yes
2 Transfer of estates Bulky Waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes	No	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Council are responsible for the collection & disposal of all household waste in the borough. An efficiency review of waste and recycling services is underway, primarily focusing on doorstep properties with wheeled bins. An analysis of service options has been produced. These options consider ease of use for residents, operational deliverability, environmental and financial impacts, particularly in relation to waste disposal market conditions. Service options are also evaluated to ensure compliance with the Waste Regulations.</p> <p>The efficiency review noted the high levels of bulky-lumber waste being produced from Lewisham Homes managed estates. Although the majority of collection costs are re-charged to Lewisham Homes, disposal costs are currently paid for by the Council. This arrangement does not incentivise housing managers to reduce the amount of waste being generated.</p>
Saving proposal
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Combinations of: Alternate weekly collections (residual waste/recycling). Charged garden waste service. Separate Paper/Card Collection. Separate Kitchen Waste Collection. 2 Re-charge bulky waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes. <p>1) Public Consultation is due to begin to gauge attitudes towards service changes based around the following areas: food collections, subscription based garden waste collections, frequency of collections, special arrangements and collecting certain materials separately. The results of the consultation combined with an analysis of the operational deliverability and environmental and financial impact, may result in a service represented by the options outlined below.</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

- a. Option 1 (current service plus garden waste): Refuse collected weekly, recycling collected co-mingled weekly and garden waste fortnightly;
- b. Option 2: Refuse collected fortnightly, recycling collected twin stream (i.e. paper separately from the rest of the recycling) fortnightly and garden & food waste collected weekly;
- c. Option 3: Refuse collected weekly, recycling collected twin-stream fortnightly and garden waste fortnightly;
- d. Option 4: Refuse collected fortnightly, recycling collected twin stream fortnightly, garden waste collected fortnightly and food waste collected weekly.
- e. Option 5: Refuse collected fortnightly, recycling collected co-mingled fortnightly, garden waste collected fortnightly and food waste collected weekly.

2) The transfer of responsibility for bulky-waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes aims to encourage more active engagement with residents to manage unreasonable expenditure and environmental impact.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Potentially large change in waste and recycling services for service users and for staff delivering the new services.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Public resistance to change. Market volatility for recyclables. High dependence on private waste disposal/transfer facilities. Very difficult to predict accurate disposal costs or income levels from recyclable materials.

Risk	Detail	Mitigation
Number of people subscribing to the garden waste service might not be as high as expected	Benchmarked with other boroughs. Modelling has been undertaken to show high and low subscription levels to account for this and financial modelling adjusted accordingly. Already have 4000 unique users of garden waste bag service and the aim is to have 13,000 subscribers (25%)	Effective communications. Target households with gardens. Target existing users. Enforce no garden waste in black bin.
Participation Rates	Residents need to participate in the services to divert waste away from the black	Effective and ongoing communications. Fortnightly collections

4. Impact and risks of proposal

	bin therefore reducing the disposal budget. Language, levels of deprivation, transient populations will also impact on participation.	should ensure that participation in the food waste service is high.
Yields	Need to capture the right materials in the right bin. Modelling has been undertaken to show high and low yields as this will impact on any future waste reduction in the black bin and future waste contracts. If yields aren't as high then performance may be affected.	Effective and ongoing Communications.
Contamination Rates	Residents need to use the services correctly otherwise contamination levels will increase. This in turn may mean that loads are rejected and performance in recycling drops. There is also the potential impact of the Environmental Permitting Regulations that may also impact on reported contamination levels.	Effective contaminated bin procedure. Effective ongoing communications. Ensure contract documentation covers contamination processes and procedures.
Commodity Prices	Materials are traded on a commodities market and prices fluctuate. At the moment the prices are reducing and this would impact on a gate fee or rebate. MRF's have different ways of approaching twin stream material pricing so difficult to judge what the impact would be on any rebate. One local newsprint company has just gone into administration.	Following the commodities market to anticipate impact.
Disposal options	SELCHP Contract ends in 2024. This is likely to mean that the cost of incineration is likely to increase. Other disposal options for garden waste, food waste, recycling may have to consider additional bulking and haulage costs if direct	Looking at reducing the tonnage that goes into SELCHP (capture more recycling, food waste). Discussions with other boroughs about joint disposal arrangements.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

	delivery isn't an option.	
Property Numbers	The assumptions used in the modelling are high level and have taken the number of kerbside properties from general data. The number of properties actually delivered to may be less when you consider space for additional containers and whether fortnightly collections can take place in particular locations / housing types.	Analysis of properties currently being undertaken.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	14,600	(2,600)	12,000
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Waste Review	600	500	1,100
Total	600	500	1,100
% of Net Budget	5%	4%	9%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes		
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3	10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more	
	No specific impact	
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?	

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Possibly
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
3	Waste Regulations
3.1	Regulation 13 of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as

10. Legal implications

amended), transposes into English law Article 11 of the EU Revised Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC). Regulation 13 states that from 1 January 2015, waste collection authorities must collect waste paper, metal, plastic and glass separately. This duty is to ensure that recyclate is of a high quality and that the quantity of recyclate collected is improved. The duty is subject to two tests:

- 3.1.1 The Necessity Test: This is to ensure that waste undergoes recovery operations to facilitate or improve recovery, which tests if the material is of a sufficiently high quality? If yes, then it is not necessary to collect the materials separately from each other.
- 3.1.2 The Practicability or TEEP Test: Is it Technically, Environmentally or Economically Practicable (TEEP) to collect the materials separately from each other? If one of these is not the case, then it is not necessary to collect the materials separately from each other.
- 3.2 There is no statutory guidance on the requirements of Regulation 13, but a 'Route Map' was produced in England by local government stakeholders which sets out a process by which local authorities may assess their position in terms of compliance with the regulation.
- 3.3 Officers are currently conducting these tests using the 'Route Map' process, at the same time as developing and analysing the future waste and recycling service options.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation) Public Consultation 21 st August – 18 th October
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review Report to Sustainable Development Select Committee
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing Report to Mayor & Cabinet
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented Savings implemented should approval be granted
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	

11. Summary timetable	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	Savings implemented in a phased approach should approval be granted
October 2016	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Replacing static street sweeping with mobile response facility – all residential roads
Reference:	N4
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Stop the routine sweeping of residential roads by traditional 'beat based' sweeper. Provide a mobile, 'as required', response service for these areas.	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The street cleansing service comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. cleaning all paved areas of the highway (footways, carriageways and pedestrianised areas); b. cleansing the council controlled car parks and the grounds of Lewisham Homes based on Service Level Agreements (SLAs); c. providing, managing and emptying 2,000 litter bins, mostly placed on streets, and collecting and disposing of litter sacks using a small fleet of 7.5 tonne refuse collection and compaction vehicles (RCVs); d. operating the booked bulky household waste (lumber) collection service; e. clearing fly-tipping – including all residual waste under the Council's Clean Streets Policy; f. cleansing at least some of the sundry green spaces that are contiguous with highways; h. over-sight of the largely outsourced public toilets contract. <p>Management Structure</p> <p>1 The service is divided into 4 operational areas, each of which is overseen by a Cleansing Team Manager, who report to the Cleansing Operational Manager. Cleansing managers have responsibility for all staff dedicated to their areas and the effectiveness of operations, including by mobile crews and resources.</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

Mechanical Resources

2 With the exception of the litter bin RCVs, the caged vehicle crews involved in household waste collections, cleansing SLA areas and priority locations such as retail areas and the vicinity of railway and bus stations, the only other significant piece of mechanical equipment involved in street cleansing is a Johnston 600 mechanical street sweeper. This latter vehicle mainly cleans Red Routes and other major roads that are largely protected by no parking restrictions. Off-side areas, refuges and splitter islands are also cleansed periodically on Sundays when traffic is lighter, with the aid of a manual crew. Prior to the budget cuts in April 2011 there were 2 Johnston 600s and a Scarab mechanical sweeping machine.

Manual Resources

3 Lewisham's street cleansing service is wholly manual, comprising street orderly carts that are generally equipped with a swish (dolly) broom, a medium yard broom, and a litter picker.

4 In April 2011 the number of management areas was reduced from 6 to 4, and the number of beat sweepers was also reduced by 20 in total. A further 14 sweeping posts were deleted from April 2015. This has resulted in a large increase in the size of the average sweeper beat, and yet the service is still aiming to guarantee to sweep every street once a week (Monday – Friday), with selected main shopping areas having dedicated sweepers on 7 days a week and secondary shopping areas also being swept on Saturdays.

Saving proposal

A saving of this size would require the loss of between 40-50 Sweeper posts. [The precise number to be determined upon reorganisation of the beat based service to mobile response units]

In order to make the saving, the traditional programmed sweeping of all residential roads will cease. This will be replaced by the creation of mobile response teams working on an intelligence based approach, e.g. problem areas / requests / complaints. To achieve an adequately resourced mobile facility it will be necessary to reduce the frequency of Town Centre and 'Main Drag' sweeping. A complete re-organisation and re-assessment of the service would be required to deliver the saving.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

There will be obvious impacts to the visual environment, e.g. increased detritus and weed growth in likely to increase pavement / highway maintenance costs. A poor visual environment and cleansing standards may generate complaints and casework in certain areas of the Borough.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Residential roads are currently swept approximately once a week, but the service allows for the more frequent sweeping of deprived and higher density areas. The aim

4. Impact and risks of proposal

would be to replace this static programmed sweeping with a responsive mobile service. Priority areas and problems would be identified, in part, by refuse collection staff who can supply frequent service standard updates. Previous savings from ceasing herbicide application on pavement areas would need to be re-instated to mitigate some of the visual deterioration to the street scene. A comprehensive restructuring of the service will need to take place to deliver these savings, shifting the emphasis from static street sweeping operatives towards an increase in vehicles, mobile teams, machinery and mobile technology. An in-house, Peer2Peer version of the LoveLewisham app is being developed to facilitate this.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	7,300	(1,600)	5,700
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Stop the routine sweeping of residential roads by traditional 'beat based' sweeper. Provide a mobile, 'as required', response service for these areas.	1,000		1,000
Total	1,000	0	1,000
% of Net Budget	18%	0%	18%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3	4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High	Medium	10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Specific impact in one or more wards
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Northern wards due to higher density housing & deprivation

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					TBC
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

--

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service
Reference:	N5
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Service/Team area:	Fleet and Passenger Services
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Review of Lewisham's Passenger Transport Service	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

The council's Fleet management service and the Door to Door service sit within the Environment division. The fleet management service procure, run and maintain the council's owned fleet and procure specialist hired in vehicles when needed. The direct revenue cost of this service is in the region of £4.1m. The costs of the service are fully recharged to end service users such as Door to Door and Refuse collection.

The Door to Door services provides home to school transport to children with special educational needs and also transports adult social care clients to and from day care provision. The council spends approx. £5.3m p/a operating passenger transport made up of direct staff and management costs and vehicle costs recharged from Fleet (fuel, staff costs, vehicle on the road costs and maintenance etc). In addition to this, the council (primarily CYP SEN and ASC) spends a further £2m p/a on taxi provision for clients that can't be accommodated on Door to Door vehicles (due to capacity of vehicles, the logistics of the routes etc.) The total spent on providing transport for this client group therefore equates to £7.3m p/a.

Saving proposal

A. Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service: The relationship with the transport provider (Environment) and the client services (primarily CYP and ASC) and the funding model for these services are interwoven and complex. As such a corporate approach is being taken in order to identify opportunities to reduce spend and demand whilst continuing to meet statutory duties and support the residents that rely on passenger transport. It is expected that the savings identified for this review will be achieved via the following approaches:

1. Operational efficiency

3. Description of service area and proposal

Identify opportunities within the current Door to Door operational model to reduce costs through more efficient use of resource and increasing operational efficiency.

2. Promoting Independence

Recent legislative changes (e.g. the Care Act and the Children and Families Bill) make the need to promote choice, independence and 'ordinary lives' essential in the delivery of services to both children and young people with SEN and clients accessing adult social care support. This extends to how we meet a client's transport needs. However the legislative changes also increase the age range applicable for travel assistance from 5-18 years to 0-25 years. Within CYP we will be exploring the potential to further embed and offer a wider range of alternative travel assistance options (such as direct payments and independent travel training) in order to better support independence and reduce reliance on local authority provided transport. Whilst direct transport provision will continue to be the most suitable option for some clients, we expect to be able to at least maintain, and possibly reduce, demand through growing and improving the range of travel assistance options we offer. It should be noted however, that there is currently an overspend on the CYP SEN budget (of approx. £700k) and as such any reduction to spend achieved as a result of this approach will be required to reduce the overspend in the first instance.

Adult Social Care will also continue to promote Direct Payments in line with the previously agreed saving for remodelling day services (A4).

The council's waste services account for a significant proportion of the costs attracted by the Fleet service. The influence of demand on those costs are being considered by the waste strategy review as a part of a separate savings strand.

3. Alternative delivery models

Explore opportunities to pursue alternative delivery models for local authority provided transport provision (e.g. via an outsourced contract).

4. Policy review

The council is required to provide transport for eligible young people of statutory school age. Other local authorities (e.g. Coventry) are now exploring removing or charging for discretionary travel for under 5s and over 16s. As part of this review we would like to explore the legal position of this approach to determine the extent to which this could be applied in Lewisham. This is a work in progress and any proposed changes to Policy would be returned to Mayor and Cabinet.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The impact of the approaches detailed in this proposal are as follows:

- Possible re-organisation within the Door to Door Service (to respond to a reduced demand from client services as a result of higher take up of direct

4. Impact and risks of proposal

payments/independent travel training, or as a result of operational efficiencies identified).

- Changes to process within the client service areas – to promote and embed a wider range of alternative travel assistance options.
- Market development – to ensure we have a suitable range of travel assistance options to offer to suitable clients (e.g. commission an independent travel training programme for SEN clients).
- Service users – Eligible clients within ASC will be offered Direct Payments as a matter of course. Within CYP, new and existing clients will be encouraged to take up travel assistance options with direct transport provision being seen as a last resort.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

For any changes the current Door to Door operating model or a reduction in service requirements as a result of reduced demand from client services (due to an increased take up of direct payments/independent travel training) staff consultation would be required.

For CYP- Consultation with service users would be required prior to the introduction of new travel assistance options, or if changes to the processes for application or the transport policies were to be pursued.

For ASC Clients – Discussions about transport requirements will form part of an individual's care plan. For those who the service is changing – consultation has already taken place as part of the previously agreed saving.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	7,884	(660)	7,224
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service	500	500	1,000
Total	500	500	1,000
% of Net Budget	7%	7%	14%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
		1. Community leadership and empowerment

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
9	10	2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact on a single ward.
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	0	0	0	0	0
Scale 3 – 5	61	61	61	0	0
Sc 6 – SO2	48	48	51	0	3
PO1 – PO5	7	7	9	0	2
PO6 – PO8	2	2	2	0	0
SMG 1 – 3	1	1	1	0	0
JNC					

9. Human Resources impact					
Total	119	119	124	0	5
Gender	Female	Male			
	53	66			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	52	64	3	0	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

TBC

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Other Environment Savings & Income
Reference:	N6
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Increase income from Trade Waste Services & Parks Events	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
We currently provide a Trade Waste collection services to around 2500 Lewisham businesses. Our parks and open spaces are subject to increasing demand for income-generating events.
Saving proposal
To develop our Trade Waste customer base, improve efficiency and increase income. To negotiate an increased share of income from Parks Events.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Improved Trade Waste services will have a positive impact on our street scene, cleansing and domestic refuse services.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
A post within the Environment Division will be developed to focus on business development opportunities. IT, Accountancy/Debt Recovery systems are being improved to facilitate an improved business focus. Each Park event is subject to consultation within the Council's Events Strategy. Increased income will, of course, be subject to this approval.

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	4,700	(2,200)	2,500
HRA			
DSG			
Health			

5. Financial information			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
To develop our Trade Waste customer base, improve efficiency and increase income. To negotiate an increased share of income from Parks Events.	250	250	500
* budget figures are commercial waste and parks budget combined			
Total	250	250	500
% of Net Budget	10%	10%	20%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
3	5	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil	

8. Service equalities impact			
		Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					TBC
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
TBC from legal re competing with Private Sector Commercial Waste companies.

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)

11. Summary timetable

September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 12 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION O

Contents page

Section O: Public Services

O4: Financial Assessments Review	217
O5: Discretionary Freedom Pass: Withdrawal of discretionary scheme	221
Draft Consultation on Proposed Removal of Discretionary Freedom Pass Scheme	225

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Financial Assessments review
Reference:	O4
LFP work strand:	Public Services
Directorate:	Customer Services Directorate
Head of Service:	Ralph Wilkinson
Service/Team area:	Public Services / Benefits
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts / Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Review Financial Assessment staff structure	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Benefit Service is responsible for administering the payment of housing benefit, discretionary housing payments, council tax reductions, concessionary awards (freedom passes, blue badges and taxi cards) and the local support scheme.</p> <p>In October 2014 the service became responsible for adult social care financial assessments as part of the Council's approach to join up assessment services where possible. The team responsible for financial assessments carry out 3,500 assessments each year but they are also responsible for managing client finances – around 50 as deputy's and 350 as appointees and some of the client property services arranging some 50 property searches and 70 funerals each year.</p>
Saving proposal
To review the way financial assessment service operates and reorganise to take advantage of streamlined procedures, better use of existing information and make better use of technology.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The outcome of the review will be a better service with less information requested from service users, faster processing times and clear procedures in place for dealing with appointee/deputyships.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The risk is that the new procedures do not meet the requirements of adult social care. A board, chaired by the Head of Public Services, has been set up to oversee the

4. Impact and risks of proposal

review and is attended by Head of Adult Social Care and others from the Community Services Directorate.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	268	0	268
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Reorganisation	100		100
Total			
% of Net Budget	37 %	%	37 %
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA
Yes / No	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
8	10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what			

8. Service equalities impact

mitigations are proposed:

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No

No

9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No

Yes

Workforce profile:

Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2	7	7	7		
PO1 – PO5	0	0	1	1	
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
	4	3			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	1	6			
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

None

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December

11. Summary timetable

January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	End entitlement to discretionary Freedom Pass
Reference:	O5
LFP work strand:	Public Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Ralph Wilkinson
Service/Team area:	Public Services / Benefits
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer and Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) End discretionary Freedom Pass scheme	Yes	Yes	No
b) Close discretionary Freedom Pass scheme to new applicants	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Benefit Service is responsible for administering the payment of housing benefit, discretionary housing payments, council tax reductions, concessionary awards (freedom passes, blue badges and taxi cards) the local support scheme and financial assessments.</p> <p>The Council issues Freedom Passes to all residents who meet the national eligibility criteria in relation to age or disability. In addition, discretionary Freedom Passes are issued to those residents who do not meet the national criteria but have mobility or mental health issues. There are currently 1,471 people are in receipt of discretionary Freedom Passes.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The proposal is to withdraw the discretionary Freedom Pass with effect from 2016. As the cost is based on usage it is difficult to be precise about exactly how much could be saved but estimates suggest the saving would be in excess of £200k pa.</p> <p>The criteria for entitlement to a discretionary Freedom Pass are:</p> <p>Criteria for mobility disability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can walk to a distance of 300 metres, but not able to walk further than this without pain or discomfort. 2. Applicant has a degenerative medical condition effecting mobility <p>Criteria for mental health conditions:</p> <p>That the applicant has an enduring mental health condition and has accessed</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

secondary care mental health services in the last 12 months.

There are 1,471 discretionary Freedom Passes in use (of which 162 have been awarded under the mobility criteria and 1,309 under the mental health criteria).

Important - The proposal does not impact on the national Freedom Pass scheme for elderly persons and for specific disabilities.

There are 32,000 elderly persons national Freedom Passes in use.

There are 5,000 disabled persons national Freedom Passes in use. See appendix 1 for eligibility.

Although withdrawing the discretionary Freedom Pass will impact on some households, there are 2 alternative schemes that may help negate the impact and are at no cost to the Council.

Job Centre Plus travel discount card (valid for up to 3 months) – This is available to residents who have been unemployed for 3 months and over, received a qualifying benefit or must be working with an advisor for a return to work, they will be able to apply for a concession that gives them half-price travel;

60+ London Oyster card – This is available to residents who live in a London borough, are over the age of 60 but who do not qualify for a Freedom Pass and they will qualify for free travel.

A recent sampling of those residents currently receiving a discretionary Freedom Pass suggested that 68% would qualify for an alternative concession, this being 63% who would qualify for the JC+ travel discount card and 5% for the 60+ London Oyster card.

A recent survey of the 33 London Boroughs found 19 (58%) have a discretionary scheme and 15 of these do not intend withdrawing it. Excluding Lewisham, of the remaining 3 boroughs, 2 are reviewing their qualifying criteria and one did not respond.

An alternative option to this saving would be to close the discretionary freedom pass scheme to new applicants – saving £20,000 in year 1 plus a further £20,000 in year 2 and in year 3. This is based on previous years where an average of 100 discretionary freedom passes holders per year are no longer entitled because their circumstances change (e.g. they move or they reach the national scheme age for an elderly persons freedom pass).

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Some service users with mobility or mental health needs will no longer be entitled to free public transport in London.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

4. Impact and risks of proposal

The saving impacts on other services – this may happen where the withdrawal of the Freedom Pass means the person becomes reliant on other Council services. A recent sample review found 7 of the 10 mobility cases sampled and 12 of the 40 mental health cases were no longer in receipt of services.

The saving is not achieved because it was an estimate – the saving is based on average usage so should be reasonably accurate. However, charging is done in arrears so there may be an issue with timing where the saving is not achieved in year 1. The timing / charging mechanism is being reviewed and discussed with London Councils who oversee the scheme.

Council reputation – communications will need to explain the reason for the change in policy. Not all London boroughs offer a discretionary scheme and of those that do some have withdrawn them or are reviewing them.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	12,242	(24)	12,218
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Either end scheme	200		200
b) or close to new applicants	20	20	40
Total	20-200	0-20	40-200
% of Net Budget	0.2%-2%	0%-0.2%	0.3%-2%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
8		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	All
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	All

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	M	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	M
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
N/A			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

DRAFT



Customer Services Directorate

Consultation on proposed
removal of discretionary
Freedom Pass scheme

September 2014

Part 1 – About this Consultation

Topic of this consultation

1. This consultation is about the proposal to stop issuing new discretionary Freedom Passes and withdraw the 1,175 passes currently in use. Discretionary Freedom Passes, which allow free travel on public transport in London, are issued on application in the following circumstances:

Criteria for mobility condition:

- Unable to walk over 300 metres unaided
- Applicant has a degenerative medical condition effecting mobility

Criteria for Mental Health conditions:

- The mental health criteria identified is that the applicant has an enduring mental health condition and has accessed secondary care mental health services in the last 12 months.

2. The proposal would generate a saving of approximately £200,000 pa.
3. It is estimated that 68% of those affected would qualify for subsidised travel under another travel scheme that is not funded by the Council.

Audience

4. Anyone may respond to this consultation and all responses will be fully considered.
5. We are particularly keen to hear from current discretionary Freedom Pass holders and agencies that deliver services to them to understand the impact the proposal may have.

Duration

6. The consultation will be open for 3 weeks from 4 November 2014. The deadline for responses is 25 November 2014.

How to Respond

7. A letter will be sent to support agencies and 100 discretionary Freedom Pass recipients. There are several ways to respond to this consultation:
 - On the Council web site
 - By post to London Borough of Lewisham, PO Box 58996, London, SE6 9JD

After the Consultation

8. Once the consultation has closed all responses will be considered and a summary of responses collated and included in a report to Mayor and Cabinet.

Part 2 – Background

9. The Transport Act 2000 sets out the criteria which are used to determine eligibility to the National Freedom Pass scheme. The criteria are:
 - Blind or partially sighted,
 - Profoundly or severely deaf,
 - Without speech,
 - Disabled or has suffered an injury, which has a substantial and long – term adverse affect on his/her ability to walk,
 - Without arms or has long – term loss of the use of both arms,
 - Has a learning disability, that is, a state of arrested or incomplete development of mind which includes significant impairment of intelligence and social functioning,
 - If applied for the grant of a licence to drive a motor vehicle under Part III of the Road Traffic Act 1988, have his/her application refused pursuant to section 92 of the Act (physical fitness) otherwise than on the ground of persistent misuse of drugs or alcohol.
10. There are 37,000 Freedom Pass holders in the borough and the proposal does not impact on any of them.
11. The Transport Act 2000 allows the Council to have a locally determined discretionary Freedom Pass scheme for persons with a disability that do not meet the above criteria. In 2008 the Council implemented a discretionary Freedom Passes scheme, which allows free travel on public transport in London. Discretionary Freedom Passes are issued on application in the following circumstances:
 - Criteria for mobility condition:**
 - Unable to walk over 300 metres unaided
 - Applicant has a degenerative medical condition effecting mobility
 - Criteria for Mental Health conditions:**
 - The mental health criteria identified is that the applicant has an enduring mental health condition and has accessed secondary care mental health services in the last 12 months.
12. There are currently 1,175 discretionary Freedom Passes issued.

Lewisham Council Financial Position

13. Since 2010 the Council has cut more than £100 million from its budget. The Council needs to find savings of £85m in the next 3 years. For this reason the council has been undertaking a fundamental review of all its budgets.

Part 3 – The proposal

14. The proposal is to stop issuing new discretionary Freedom Passes and to withdraw those currently in use to deliver a saving of approximately £200,000 pa.

15. A recent sampling exercise of those currently in receipt of a discretionary Freedom Pass suggested that 68% would qualify for an alternative concession, this being 63% who would qualify for the JC+ travel discount card and 5% for the 60+ London Oyster card.

- JC+ travel discount card – This is available to residents who have been unemployed for 3 months and over, received a qualifying benefit or must be working with an advisor for a return to work, they will be able to apply for a concession that gives them half-price travel;
- 60+ London Oyster card – This is available to residents who live in a London borough, are over the age of 60 but who do not qualify for a FP and they will qualify for free travel.

Timetable

16. The proposed timetable for the proposal which is subject to agreement by Mayor and Cabinet and the consultation process is:

23 October 2014 – report to Mayor and Cabinet
4 November 2014 – consultation process
December 2014 – Mayor and Cabinet
January 2014 - implementation

Part 4 – Consultation Questions

17. We are happy to receive responses to this consultation in any format and we are particularly keen to hear your views on the following:

- b. What will the impact be if the Council stops offering a discretionary Freedom Pass?

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 13 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION P

Contents page

Section P: Planning

P2: Planning Service – Budget Savings 2016/17 and 2017/18

231

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Planning Service – Budget Savings 2016/17 and 2017/18
Reference:	P2
LFP work strand:	Planning
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	John Miller
Service/Team area:	Planning Service, incorporating Development Management, Conservation & Urban Design, Planning Policy and Economic Development.
Cabinet portfolio:	Growth and Regeneration
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Restructure of Development Management team and restructure and amalgamation of the Conservation, Urban Design and Planning Policy teams. (£185k)	Yes	No	Yes
b) Substitution of part of base budget by alternative funding sources (S.106 and fee income). (£45K)	Yes	No	No
c) Further increase in charges and changes to funding together with an assessment of savings achievable from a corporate approach to and restructure of employment services. (£305k)	Yes	No	Yes
d) Review of Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on the way in which the service consults on planning applications. Efficiency savings based on paper, printing and postage costs. (£20k).	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

The Planning Service forms part of the Resources and Regeneration Directorate and operates from 3rd Floor Laurence House. The Planning Service currently comprises: Forward Planning, Urban Design and Conservation, Development Management, Land Charges and Economic Development. This saving proposal affects all areas of the Planning Service.

Development Management deals with individual planning applications within the policy framework set by the development plan, as well as appeals against Council decisions, and enforcement action against unauthorised development. This team has recently been re-structured, but further changes are required to provide a more proactive and delivery focused approach, with more resources needed to be allocated to pre-application discussions with applicants and the local community. Closer and more flexible working is also required between the planning officer, support and enforcement functions to enable the service to be more efficient and effective.

Forward Planning provides a policy framework in the development plan to promote and guide development and investment in the built environment.

Design and Conservation advise on planning applications and undertake specific projects to protect and improve the environment and to promote development opportunities.

Economic Development exists to provide strategic expertise on matters relating to the economy as well as providing guidance, commissioning and delivery of employment and business support. It also provides an EU funding and advisory role council wide.

Saving proposal

Savings proposal covers 4 areas of potential budget savings:

1. A staff re-structure of our Development Management team to further embed the principles of Development Management and to enable us to build flexible, well trained Planning Casework teams that can respond to fluctuations in caseload. Wherever possible, case officers will be fully responsible for all aspects of the processing of their applications.
2. An amalgamation and re-structure of our Conservation & Urban Design and Planning Policy teams.
3. Increasing the non-statutory fees / charges for major developments and funding services / posts from CIL / S.106 income. This will reduce the Planning Service's base budget, without impacting service delivery.
4. A Council wide review to include the role and function of the Economic Development service in delivering place making, business development and employment objectives.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

1. Planning Case Officers will have more input and control into the quality and processing timescales of their individual caseloads. A larger percentage of Planning decisions will be issued within published timescales. Residents and other professional bodies will be able to contact their Planning Officer for the majority of aspects of their application.
2. Residents, Members and other professional bodies will have a single point of contact for strategic Planning Policy, Conservation and Urban Design queries / comments. Clearer career paths in place for staff within these teams.
3. There will be little, if any, impact on service users in increasing the non-statutory fees / charges for major developments and changes to way the Planning Service is funded.
4. There may potentially be significant impacts on economic development service users depending on the outcome of the corporate review.
5. Residents will be impacted by the proposed changes to the SCI as they will no longer be sent an individual notification letter. These will be replaced by additional site notices.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

1. Planning policy could increase in relation to the government's recent reforms and interest in Neighbourhood Planning. The latter is increasing the borough; such as Deptford and New Cross where there could be significant tensions between local objectives and the Council's regeneration programme. The full impact of these pressures on the planning service is not yet known.
2. Changing or ceasing some activities / responsibilities of the Economic Development service could significantly reduce the Council's ability to assist residents into work or support businesses to locate and grow in the borough.
3. Legislation has now been passed to enable HM Land Registry to take responsibility for and administer the Local Land Charges Service. This could result in loss of up to £220k annual income which underpins the planning service's net budget. However, the council will still need to maintain the Local Land Charges Register and supply the necessary data to Land Registry.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	3,270	(1,611)	1,659
HRA	N/A		
DSG	N/A		
Health	N/A		
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Restructure of Development Management team and restructure and amalgamation of the Conservation, Urban Design and Planning Policy teams.	185		185

5. Financial information			
b) Substitution of part of base budget by alternative funding sources (S.106 and fee income).	45		45
c) Further increase in charges and changes to funding coupled with savings achievable from a corporate approach to and restructure of employment services.		305	305
d) Review of Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on the way in which the service consults on planning applications. Efficiency savings based on paper, printing and postage costs. (£20k).		20	20
Total	230	325	555
% of Net Budget	13%	20%	33%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10	5	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Impact on users is considered low, and may occur as a result to changes in the Economic Development Service.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	0	0	2	0	2
Scale 3 – 5	2	2	5	3	0
Sc 6 – SO2	8	8	14	6	0
PO1 – PO5	27	24.8	33	6	0
PO6 – PO8	3	2.9	4	1	0
SMG 1 – 3	1	1	2	1	0
JNC	1	1	1	0	0
Total	42	39.7	61	17	2
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

This proposal is subject to staff consultation as stipulated within the Council's Employment/Change Management policies.

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	

LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

APPENDIX 14 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION Q

Contents page

Section Q: Early Intervention and Safeguarding

Q3: Targeted Services Savings	239
Includes: Sensory Teachers	
Educational Psychologists	
Occupational Therapy – management reorganisation	
Reduce Carers funding	
Review of MAPP portage with increased health contribution	
Joint commissioning	
Q4: Safeguarding Services	247
Includes: Social care supplies and services reduced spend	
Social care financial management through continued cost control	
Placements: continuing strategy	
Q5: Youth Service	253

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Targeted Services Savings
Reference:	Q3
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding and Early Intervention
Directorate:	Children & Young People
Head of Service:	Warwick Tomsett
Service/Team area:	Children & Young People
Cabinet portfolio:	Children & Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children & Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Sensory Teachers: A Reduction in the Equipment Budget	NO	NO	NO
b) Sensory Teachers: The DSG regulations indicate that any individual support would be from DSG resources so costs can be recharged to DSG.	NO	NO	NO
c) Educational Psychologists: Further reduction in staffing through not replacing staff	NO	NO	YES
d) Occupational Therapy – management reorganisation	NO	NO	YES
e) Reduce Carers funding	NO	NO	NO
f) Review of MAPP	NO	NO	NO
g) Joint commissioning Increased contribution from health toward joint commissioning work for children's services.	NO	NO	NO

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Children with Complex Needs The Children with Complex Needs Service provides the following services to enable

3. Description of service area and proposal

Children with Complex Needs

The Children with Complex Needs Service provides the following services to enable Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities to achieve better life outcomes, they include:

- Multi-Agency Planning Pathway Service;
- Portage Service;
- Short Breaks Service;
- Occupational Therapy Service;
- Special Educational Needs Service;
- Social Work Service for Children with Disabilities.

The overall budget is £2.9m excluding placement costs but including support and packages of care. The overall reduction would be 13%. In 2013/14 savings of c£200k were made following a service restructure. The service is involved in the implementation of the latest SEND reforms (Children & Families Act 2014) which has put a significant pressure on the service in terms of case work delivery.

Multi-Agency Planning Pathway Service (MAPP):

MAPP is a care co-ordination service across health, education and social care. MAPP also provides a care co-ordination for Discharge Planning, Joint Initial Assessment Clinic (JIAC) and Continuing Care.

MAPP also undertakes a statutory role with Education, Health and Care plans for children and young people under the age of 5 years of age.

Portage:

Portage is an educational home visiting service for pre-school children with developmental needs. The aim of Portage is to support the development of young children's play, communication, relationships and full participation in day to day life at home and within the wider community. Support offered through Portage is based on the principle that parents are the key figures in the development of their child and Portage aims to help parents to be confident in this role, regardless of their child's needs. The service plays a key role in managing expectations and reducing dependency on services.

The Short Breaks service:

- enables eligible parents/carers with disabled children and young people to have a short break from their caring responsibilities;
- ensures that while the parents/ carers are receiving a break from their caring responsibilities that their disabled child or young person additional needs are being met and that they benefiting as much as their parents/ carers from this short break.

Occupational Therapy Service:

The Occupational Therapy Service provides specialist equipment and adaptations within the home to ensure safety and to increase and maximise the potential of independent living and participation in daily living activities for children and young people with disabilities.

Special Educational Needs Service:

The Special Educational Needs (SEN) team works closely with parents, young people, education settings, social care and health services on undertaking Education, Health

3. Description of service area and proposal

and Care Needs assessments to ensure that children and young people with SEND have improved life outcomes and maximise their educational potential. They have a statutory role under the Children and families Act 2014.

Social Work Service for Children with Disabilities:

The Social Work Service for Children with Disabilities provides assessment and support to disabled children and young people and their families. The Social Work Team operates across the full spectrum of social work interventions this includes child protection, Children in Need, Looked After Children and Transition

STEPS – Specialist Teachers and Educational Psychology Service

STEPS is made up of three teams:

- Sensory Specialist Teachers Team
- Specific Learning Difficulties Specialist Teachers Team (SpLD)
- Educational Psychology Team (EP)

The SpLD and EP Teams provide assessments and consultations to settings and families to enable CYP to maximise their learning opportunities and for settings to increase their capacity to address the needs of CYP with special needs. Both teams provide training to settings and SENCOs. Both teams are involved in the implementation of the latest SEND reforms and have a statutory role in providing advice as part of the EHC assessments. The EP team provides psychological advice to every CYP who has an EHC assessment. This is a significant pressure on capacity.

The Sensory Team provides assessment, monitoring and specialist support for children and young people with a visual or hearing impairment, including direct teaching of visual/hearing impaired children and young people as appropriate. The team works with the young person/child, their families/carers and partner agencies to ensure the child can fully access education and make progress in order to fulfil their aspirations. The team carries out assessments as part of the SEND pathway, contributing to EHC assessments. The team provides training to settings and partner agencies as well as providing specialist equipment furniture and materials for CYP. The budget for these specialist resources is currently.

STEPS contribute to raising the achievement of all CYP and contribute to safeguarding, as well as being integral to the multidisciplinary work which is integral to the recent SEND reforms.

STEPS contribute to raising the achievement of all CYP and contribute to safeguarding, as well as being integral to the multidisciplinary work which is integral to the recent SEND reforms.

Joint Commissioning

The current budget is £545k which includes £150k from the CCG.

The joint commissioning service undertakes commissioning on behalf of the Local Authority and the CCG for CYP services. This includes:

- Services for the early years, including Health Visiting, Family Nurse Partnership and Children's Centres
- Early Intervention and Targeted Services, including Targeted Family Support, Family Intervention Project

3. Description of service area and proposal

- Children's Community Health Services, including children's community nursing, community paediatrics service, special needs nursing, school nurses and immunisations, care and support in the home, and therapies services
- CAMHS services
- Looked After Children's commissioning (such as foster carer recruitment, residential placements, independent visiting)
- Maternity services

The service also undertakes service redesign and analysis, including supporting the restructure of the Youth Support Service in 2014, and implementing Personal Health Budgets (for the CCG, and in partnership with the SEND programme)

In May 2015, the CCG will be transferring responsibility for Maternity commissioning to the CYP joint commissioning team, and a financial contribution will accompany this transfer to reflect the work undertaken by the team on behalf of the CCG.

In October 2015, NHSE will be transferring responsibility for commissioning for 0-5 services to the Local Authority. There is a contribution of approx £30k for this. As the team has effectively managed HV services prior to the transfer, it is anticipated that this can be offered up as a saving and included in these saving figures

Saving proposal

a) Sensory Teachers: A reduction in the Equipment Budget to reflect actual levels of demand would provide a saving of **£60k**. This would amount to a reduction of 33% in the budget and could be achieved without impact on service delivery.

b) Sensory Teachers: The DSG regulations suggest assessment and monitoring should be funded through the General Fund but any individual support can be funded from DSG resources. An assessment of the time on activities provided by the team is that 2.5fte would count as support and can be charged to the DSG. This would provide a saving of **£190k** to the General Fund or 40% of the budget.

c) Educational Psychologists: Further reduction in staffing through not replacing staff or replacing vacant roles on lower grades to save **£35k** or 10% of the budget.

d) Occupational Therapy – The management restructure will align the OT service within the LA with the health OT service provided by L&G Trust. This would produce a saving of **£50k or 50%** of the budget.

e) Reduce Carers Funding £40k

This saving is achieved through reducing the commissioning of Contact a Family to co-ordinate the provision of short breaks to families with disabled children and young people (£14k). This can be achieved without significantly impacting on service delivery and makes a small impact on the overall commissioning from Contact a Family. The remainder of this saving (£26k) results from the non-renewal of a small contract with Carers Lewisham. Carers Lewisham has a larger contract with the council which will continue. These grants are funded from the Short Breaks Budget of £1.2m.

f) Review of MAPP Team - This saving to the GF is achieved through increasing the Health contribution to the service by **£120k**. This saving is under negotiation and would represent 50% of the current budget provision.

3. Description of service area and proposal

g) Joint Commissioning of Health services

This saving is achieved through increasing the contribution from the CCG towards joint commissioning work for children's services. This will deliver **£50K** in savings to the GF (9% of the budget).

In May 2015, the CCG will be transferring responsibility for Maternity commissioning to the CYP joint commissioning team, and a financial contribution will accompany this transfer to reflect the work undertaken by the team on behalf of the CCG.

In October 2015, NHSE will be transferring responsibility for commissioning for 0-5 services to the Local Authority. There is a contribution of approx £30k for this. As the team has effectively managed HV services prior to the transfer, it is anticipated that this can be offered up as a saving and included in these saving figures.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The proposals where there are risks are as follows:

It is considered that for (a) to (c) and (g) can be achieved without impact to families and any actual risk.

d) The management restructure will align the OT service within the LA with the OT service provided by L&G Trust. The focus of the service in both teams is arguably different, and may make alignment difficult; there may also be an impact on casework capacity which will need to be addressed.

e) The Children with Complex Needs service established a new targeted Short Breaks service in 2013. The new service enables eligible parents/carers with disabled children and young people to have a short break from their caring responsibilities. This service is now well established and as a result we no longer require Contact a Family to provide short breaks. We will be continuing to work with Contact a Family to ensure that we continue to support the families that were known to them. The budget provision for this continuing work is £48k. On the ending of the contract with Carers Lewisham the organization will continue to be supported for work with children and young people through their Community Sector Grants award.

f) The negotiations to secure additional financial contributions from Health may not be successful.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

TBC

5. Financial information

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	3,540	(682)	2,858
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Sensory Teachers	60		60
b) Sensory Teachers	190		190
c) Educational Psychologists	35		35
d) Occupational Therapy	50		50
e) Reduce Carers Funding	40		40
f) Review of MAPP Team	120		120
g) Joint Commissioning of Health services	50		50
Total	545		545
% of Net Budget	19%	0%	19%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	YES	YES	NO
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	Increased pressure on central expenditure budgets of DSG that will need to be agreed by Schools Forum. The DSG provides £100k support for two social workers to work with schools.		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
7	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
NEUTRAL	NEUTRAL	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
LOW	LOW	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	LOW	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			NO

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					YES (OT Service)
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5	3	2.6	2.6		
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
	3				
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	1	2			
Disability	Yes	No			
		x			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>There is a statutory framework for joint commissioning of social care and health services and each year the Council and the CCG agree their respective financial contribution towards the budget required to deliver the services and make decisions as to the letting of contracts to providers. Each partner can delegate its function to the other, if this is considered to be in the interests of stakeholders and the efficient delivery of the services. Any reductions in budget will involve negotiation and</p>

10. Legal implications

agreement with the CCG. Where the Council holds the budget it must ensure this is managed to avoid any overspend.

As these services are provided to vulnerable young people, to the extent that there is a change to the provision, then consultation will be required and a report setting out the outcome of such consultation placed before the decision maker. The recipients of the service have protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 and the Council must comply with its statutory duty under this Act

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc.), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Safeguarding Services
Reference:	Q4
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding and Early Intervention
Directorate:	Children & Young People
Head of Service:	Alastair Pettigrew (Interim)
Service/Team area:	Children & Young People
Cabinet portfolio:	Children & Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children & Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Social Care Supplies and Services reduced spend	NO	NO	NO
b) Social care financial management through continued cost control on all areas of spend.	NO	NO	NO
Placements: continuing strategy to use local authority foster placements where possible.	NO	NO	NO

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Children's Social Care service currently has c500 Looked After Children for whom it is responsible and has placed in fostering or residential placements. The budgeted cost of this in 2015/16 is £31m with social worker costs of £10m. In support of these costs the service incurs a range of Supplies and Services expenditure, with a value of £1.5m, covering: conferences, consultancy, advertising, subscriptions, equipment, and third party payments.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>Social Care Supplies and Services: A detailed review of budgets, totalling £1.5m, that fall under the classification "supplies and services" including payments to third parties has been undertaken. Some of the budgets were being used to offset the spending pressures on placements costs and salaries. The review has reduced proposed budgets to be in line with most recent spend experience and to reflect actions to further reduce planned expenditure. The proposal would produce a saving of £370k over two years. The budget concerned covers equipment, conferences, consultancy, advertising, subscriptions, equipment, and third party payments. The reduction proposed represents 25% of the past budget.</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

Social Care:

This proposal is to improve social care financial management across the £42.5m of social care spend through a wider review of processes for financial decision making at the frontline. In the first instance the focus is on the management of placement costs with the objective of reducing unit costs from their current position. This will involve a more detailed analysis and monitoring of placement decisions, costs and ensuring closer control of placements that are ending or changing. This is being introduced in 2015 but it is not clear yet what the full scale of any cost reductions may be. The proposal is currently estimated to produce a saving of £100k. It is also planned to review procurement of and arrangements for supporting young people who are categorised as leaving care.

Placements:

The proposal is to continue to reduce spend in 2017/18 through a further focus on the use of specialist foster carers for challenging young people. These placements are very expensive ones costing in the region of £3,000 a week. This proposal would propose to pay £800 for fostering costs plus say, £800 for additional support, giving a total of £1600 instead of the £3000. The saving of **£200k** is based on 3 placements using these specialist carers.

A similar saving has been agreed for 2015/16 and covers 4 placements, this proposal would need to be reviewed in the light of the progress of that proposal. This additional saving is not expected to be delivered until 2017/18 and will require some careful thought and planning during 2015 and 2016 to avoid any unintended consequences in its implementation. The saving represents 1% of the placements budget this compares with the savings of 6% agreed for 2015/16.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

- a) This saving may impact on staff training and development, and reduced scope for access to external expertise. This may impact upon the skill levels of social workers in the service. Also, a budget with a degree of under spending each year will not be available to support other over spending areas in children's social care. No direct impact on young people is anticipated from this proposal.
- b) Potentially, additional management time will need to be dedicated to oversight of placements and costs rather than care planning and staff management that could have an impact on care arrangements for some young people and children.
- c) If we are able to attract specialist foster carers to care for challenging teenagers this will have a positive impact on those service users. The risk is that some of the identified target group will not be ready to live in a family, the placement will break down and the young person will end up in more expensive residential units. There may also be pressure from existing foster carers who have been caring long-term for young people who become challenging as they get older, that they should receive enhanced rates.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

General

4. Impact and risks of proposal

If the number of Looked after Children (c500 currently) increases in line with the rising population (10 per annum) or the rise in child protection work leads to a rise in care proceedings this will offset the financial impact of the savings.

- a) This proposal would not impact upon children and young people directly.
- b) Changes in the recording and analysis of placements is underway to ensure better management of placement costs and decisions it may however be difficult to ascribe any reduced expenditure to the impact of these changes as opposed to other management and procurement activities.
- c) There is an increased possibility of placement breakdown for more challenging children if specialist foster carers are not successful in their support of these young people.

The current demand for foster placements in Kent and London will make the identification of foster placements, especially for more challenging children, more difficult to achieve. The savings proposal will rely on the ability to identify and train local foster carers to take on and support more challenging children.

Existing foster carers may expect higher rates for current children but the additional support proposed, for the most challenging young people, will be considered on a case by case approach.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	34,504	(200)	34,304
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Social Care Supplies and Services	130	240	370
b) Social Care	50	50	100
c) Placements	0	200	200
Total	180	490	670
% of Net Budget	0.5%	1.4%	1.9%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	YES	NO	NO
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
7	10	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
NEGATIVE	POSITIVE	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		economy
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	6. Decent homes for all
HIGH	LOW	7. Protection of children
		8. Caring for adults and the older people
		9. Active, healthy citizens
		10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
There is no major equalities impact other than the fact that it will impact on children			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			NO

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	NO

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>The Council has statutory responsibility to provide services appropriate to meet assessed need for Children in Need , and also Looked After Children, for whom we may or may not be exercising parental responsibility.</p> <p>There are differing levels of regulation applicable to services, ranging from a wide discretion as to meeting need pursuant to s17 Children Act 1989, to clear regulations relating to Looked After Children and those leaving care.</p> <p>More detailed legal implications will be prepared appropriate to the individual proposals.</p>

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity

11. Summary timetable

August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Youth Service
Reference:	Q5
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding and Early Intervention
Directorate:	Children & Young People
Head of Service:	Warwick Tomsett
Service/Team area:	Children & Young People
Cabinet portfolio:	Children & Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children & Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Youth Service tapering of financial support	YES	NO	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>Lewisham Council's Youth Service budget covers a two-pronged statutory obligation: facilitate access to positive activities for young people to build life skills, and track young people's current education and employment statuses in order to report to Central Government the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) and then ensure these young people receive appropriate support.</p> <p>The Youth Service provides and facilitates access to a range of activities for young people through a combination of direct delivery, support to access delivery provided by other organisations, and commissioning and partnering with the voluntary sector. The activities are now focused on developing young people's life skills as agreed in the previous reorganisation of the service.</p> <p>Provision includes positive activities for young people, offering them places to go and things to do, including social and cultural activities, sports and play, and early intervention services. The Youth Service also offers informal education, advice and guidance on career choices and healthier lifestyles, and information concerning the dangers of substance misuse.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>Youth Service (£1.7m)</p> <p>The service is currently developing proposals for the creation of a staff and young people led mutual for the youth service. A separate report on this, outlining the business plan and demonstrating the viability, will be presented to Scrutiny and Mayor and Cabinet in the late autumn, including the potential savings that will be achieved.</p> <p>This proposal is to include an initial financial tapering for the mutual at £150k per annum, to a total of £300k by the end of 2017/18. This will be included in the financial modelling as part of the business plan.</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

--

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

--

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The proposal to taper the financial support to the mutual increases the challenge in establishing the mutual successfully. However this will be mitigated through the detailed business planning process. It may be that the delivery of the £300k is not split as evenly across the two years as shown here, but will be factored in for the full delivery by the end of 2017/18.

The expectation that the mutual proposal will achieve further savings will be addressed in the business plan and report to be presented firstly to CYP Select Committee, then Mayor & Cabinet later in the autumn.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	2,000	(300)	1,700
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	150	150	300
Total	150	150	300
% of Net Budget	9%	9%	18%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	YES	NO	NO
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
2		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency,
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Not for this proposal. A full EIA will be needed for the separate report covering the mutual proposal.

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	NO

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>A full report will go to Mayor and Cabinet setting out the proposals for the development of a mutual to deliver the youth services. This report will contain detailed legal and financial implications. If the formation of a mutual is agreed, then the Lewisham mutual would have to compete in the market for a contract for the youth service for a period of up to three years although only mutuals will be permitted to tender. The Council will have to specify the nature of the services it requires the mutual to deliver although this can be in the form of an output specification to allow the bidders to come forward with their own proposals as to how to deliver the services and to offer, if they so wish, any innovative proposals. It is lawful to offer Initial financial or other support to the mutuals provided that it is fair to all bidders and not discriminatory. There will be employment implications which will be set out in the Report.</p>

11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	CYP Select 17 November 2015 with Draft Business Plan
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

Appendix 15 – Corporate Savings Principles

Prior to the General Election in 2010, the Labour Government instituted a programme of austerity planned over a five year period. In 2010 the Coalition Government increased the level of and pace of “fiscal consolidation” (i.e. tax increases and spending cuts) that applied to the nation’s public finances. In 2013 these were increased again such that the original plans of the (then) Labour Government to reduce public spending have been increased dramatically. To ensure that this scale of service cuts did not impact adversely on front-line services the Mayor and Cabinet agreed a set of principles to underpin the Council’s decision making. These principles ensure that we:

- 1) Take account of the impact on service outcomes and social results for customers and citizens
- 2) Be prudent and sustainable for the longer term, we will not just opt for shortterm fixes
- 3) Reflect a coherent “one organisation” approach that avoids silo-based solutions
- 4) Encourage self-reliance, mutualism and cooperative endeavour
- 5) Mitigate potential harm in accordance with an appropriate assessment of needs
- 6) Be mindful of the impact on the geography of fairness across Lewisham (and our boundaries)
- 7) Involve service users, staff and other stakeholders in the redesign of services for the future
- 8) Consider the current or potential actions of other public agencies and the voluntary sector locally, including sharing and reshaping services (Total Place)
- 9) Consider the impact on the Lewisham approach where we listen to all voices, take account of all views and then we move forward to implement.



This guidance has been updated to reflect the new equality duty which came into force on 5 April 2011. It provides advice about the general equality duty.

0BIntroduction

With major reductions in public spending, public authorities in Britain are being required to make difficult financial decisions. This guide sets out what is expected of you as a decision-maker or leader of a public authority responsible for delivering key services at a national, regional and/or local level, in order to make such decisions as fair as possible.

The new public sector equality duty (the equality duty) does not prevent you from making difficult decisions such as reorganisations and relocations, redundancies, and service reductions, nor does it stop you from making decisions which may affect one group more than another group. The equality duty enables you to demonstrate that you are making financial decisions in a fair, transparent and accountable way, considering the needs and the rights of different members of your community. This is achieved through assessing the impact that changes to policies, procedures and practices could have on different protected groups (or protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010).

Assessing the impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is not just something that the law requires, it is a positive opportunity for you as a public authority leader to ensure you make better decisions based on robust evidence.

1BWhat the law requires

Under the equality duty (set out in the Equality Act 2010), public authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

The protected groups covered by the equality duty are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The duty also covers marriage and civil partnerships, but only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination.

The law requires that public authorities demonstrate that they have had 'due regard' to the aims of the equality duty in their decision-making. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which public authorities can demonstrate that they have had 'due regard'.

It is also important to note that public authorities subject to the equality duty are also likely to be subject to the Human Rights Act. We would therefore recommend that public authorities consider the potential impact their decisions could have on human rights.

2BAim of this guide

This guide aims to assist decision-makers in ensuring that:

- The process they follow to assess the impact on equality of financial proposals is robust, and
- The impact that financial proposals could have on protected groups is thoroughly considered before any decisions are arrived at.

We have also produced detailed guidance for those responsible for assessing the impact on equality of their policies, which is available on our website:

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/EqualityAct/PSED/equality_analysis_guidance.pdf

3BThe benefits of assessing the impact on equality

By law, your assessments of impact on equality must:

- Contain enough information to enable a public authority to demonstrate it has had 'due regard' to the aims of the equality duty in its decision-making
- Consider ways of mitigating or avoiding any adverse impacts.

Such assessments do not have to take the form of a document called an equality impact assessment. If you choose not to develop a document of this type, then some alternative approach which systematically assesses any adverse impacts of a change in policy, procedure or practice will be required.

Assessing impact on equality is not an end in itself and it should be tailored to, and be proportionate to, the decision that is being made.

Whether it is proportionate for an authority to conduct an assessment of the impact on equality of a financial decision or not depends on its relevance to the authority's particular function and its likely impact on people from the protected groups.

We recommend that you document your assessment of the impact on equality when developing financial proposals. This will help you to:

- **Ensure you have a written record of the equality considerations** you have taken into account.
- **Ensure that your decision includes a consideration of the actions that would help to avoid or mitigate any impacts on particular protected groups.** Individual decisions should also be informed by the wider context of

decisions in your own and other relevant public authorities, so that particular groups are not unduly affected by the cumulative effects of different decisions.

- **Make your decisions based on evidence:** a decision which is informed by relevant local and national information about equality is a better quality decision. Assessments of impact on equality provide a clear and systematic way to collect, assess and put forward relevant evidence.
- **Make the decision-making process more transparent:** a process which involves those likely to be affected by the policy, and which is based on evidence, is much more open and transparent. This should also help you secure better public understanding of the difficult decisions you will be making in the coming months.
- **Comply with the law:** a written record can be used to demonstrate that due regard has been had. Failure to meet the equality duty may result in authorities being exposed to costly, time-consuming and reputation-damaging legal challenges.

4B When should your assessments be carried out?

Assessments of the impact on equality must be carried out at a **formative stage** so that the assessment is an integral part of the development of a proposed policy, not a later justification of a policy that has already been adopted. Financial proposals which are relevant to equality, such as those likely to impact on equality in your workforce and/or for your community, should always be subject to a thorough assessment. This includes proposals to outsource or procure any of the functions of your organisation. The assessment should form part of the proposal, and you should consider it carefully **before** making your decision.

If you are presented with a proposal that has not been assessed for its impact on equality, you should question whether this enables you to consider fully the proposed changes and its likely impact. Decisions not to assess the impact on equality should be fully documented, along with the reasons and the evidence used to come to this conclusion. This is important as authorities may need to rely on this documentation if the decision is challenged.

It is also important to remember that the potential impact is not just about numbers. Evidence of a serious impact on a small number of individuals is just as important as something that will impact on many people.

5B What should I be looking for in my assessments?

Assessments of impact on equality need to be based on relevant information and enable the decision-maker to understand the equality implications of a decision and any alternative options or proposals.

As with everything, proportionality is a key principle. Assessing the impact on equality of a major financial proposal is likely to need significantly more effort

and resources dedicated to ensuring effective engagement, than a simple assessment of a proposal to save money by changing staff travel arrangements.

There is no prescribed format for assessing the impact on equality, but the following questions and answers provide guidance to assist you in determining whether you consider that an assessment is robust enough to rely on:

• **Is the purpose of the financial proposal clearly set out?**

A robust assessment will set out the reasons for the change; how this change can impact on protected groups, as well as whom it is intended to benefit; and the intended outcome. You should also think about how individual financial proposals might relate to one another. This is because a series of changes to different policies or services could have a severe impact on particular protected groups.

Joint working with your public authority partners will also help you to consider thoroughly the impact of your joint decisions on the people you collectively serve.

Example: A local authority takes separate decisions to limit the eligibility criteria for community care services; increase charges for respite services; scale back its accessible housing programme; and cut concessionary travel. Each separate decision may have a significant effect on the lives of disabled residents, and the cumulative impact of these decisions may be considerable. This combined impact would not be apparent if the decisions were considered in isolation.

• **Has the assessment considered available evidence?**

Public authorities should consider the information and research already available locally and nationally. The assessment of impact on equality should be underpinned by up-to-date and reliable information about the different protected groups that the proposal is likely to have an impact on. A lack of information is not a sufficient reason to conclude that there is no impact.

• **Have those likely to be affected by the proposal been engaged?**

Engagement is crucial to assessing the impact on equality. There is no explicit requirement to engage people under the equality duty, but it will help you to improve the equality information that you use to understand the possible impact on your policy on different protected groups. No-one can give you a better insight into how proposed changes will have an impact on, for example, disabled people, than disabled people themselves.

• **Have potential positive and negative impacts been identified?**

It is not enough to state simply that a policy will impact on everyone equally; there should be a more in-depth consideration of available evidence to see if particular protected groups are more likely to be affected than others. Equal treatment does not always produce equal outcomes; sometimes authorities

will have to take particular steps for certain groups to address an existing disadvantage or to meet differing needs.

• **What course of action does the assessment suggest that I take? Is it justifiable?**

The assessment should clearly identify the option(s) chosen, and their potential impacts, and document the reasons for this decision. There are four possible outcomes of an assessment of the impact on equality, and more than one may apply to a single proposal:

Outcome 1: No major change required when the assessment has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to advance equality have been taken.

Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers identified by the assessment or to better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified?

Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified some potential for adverse impacts or missed opportunities to advance equality. In this case, the justification should be included in the assessment and should be in line with the duty to have 'due regard'. For the most important relevant policies, compelling reasons will be needed. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact, as discussed below.

Outcome 4: Stop and rethink when an assessment shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination.

• **Are there plans to alleviate any negative impacts?**

Where the assessment indicates a potential negative impact, consideration should be given to means of reducing or mitigating this impact. This will in practice be supported by the development of an action plan to reduce impacts. This should identify the responsibility for delivering each action and the associated timescales for implementation. Considering what action you could take to avoid any negative impact is crucial, to reduce the likelihood that the difficult decisions you will have to take in the near future do not create or perpetuate inequality.

Example: A University decides to close down its childcare facility to save money, particularly given that it is currently being under-used. It identifies that doing so will have a negative impact on women and individuals from different racial groups, both staff and students.

In order to mitigate such impacts, the University designs an action plan to ensure relevant information on childcare facilities in the area is disseminated to staff and students in a timely manner. This will help to improve partnership working with the local authority and to ensure that sufficient and affordable childcare remains accessible to its students and staff.

• **Are there plans to monitor the actual impact of the proposal?**

Although assessments of impact on equality will help to anticipate a proposal's likely effect on different communities and groups, in reality the full impact of a decision will only be known once it is introduced. It is therefore important to set out arrangements for reviewing the actual impact of the proposals once they have been implemented.

6B What happens if you don't properly assess the impact on equality of relevant decisions?

If you have not carried out an assessment of impact on equality of the proposal, or have not done so thoroughly, you risk leaving yourself open to legal challenges, which are both costly and time-consuming. Recent legal cases have shown what can happen when authorities do not consider their equality duties when making decisions.

Example: A court recently overturned a decision by Haringey Council to consent to a large-scale building redevelopment in Wards Corner in Tottenham, on the basis that the council had not considered the impact of the proposal on different racial groups before granting planning permission.

However, the result can often be far more fundamental than a legal challenge. If people feel that an authority is acting high-handedly or without properly involving its service users or employees, or listening to their concerns, they are likely to become disillusioned with you.

Above all, authorities which fail to carry out robust assessments of the impact on equality risk making poor and unfair decisions that could discriminate against particular protected groups and perpetuate or worsen inequality.

As part of its regulatory role to ensure compliance with the equality duty, the Commission will monitor financial decisions with a view to ensuring that these have been taken in compliance with the equality duty and have taken into account the need to mitigate negative impacts where possible.

Appendix 17 – Summary of Savings as a Navigation Table

Please note, the page numbers refer to the page numbers of the left hand side of the Savings Proposal Report.

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
A	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health									
A11	Managing and improving transition plans	200	300	500	Y	N	N	1	Healthier	31
A12	Reducing costs of staff management, assessment and care planning	500	200	700	Y	N	Y	1	Healthier	35
A13	Alternative Delivery Models for the provision of care and support services, including mental health	1,100	700	1,800	Y	Y	Y	1	Healthier	39
A14	Achieving best value in care packages	600	500	1,100	N	N	N	1	Healthier	43
A15	New delivery models for extra care – Provision of Contracts	100	900	1,000	Y	Y	N	1	Healthier	47
A16	Prescribed Medication	130		130	N	N	N	1	Healthier	51
A16	Dental Public Health	20		20	N	N	N	1	Healthier	51
A16	Health Protection		23	23	N	N	N	1	Healthier	51
A16	Obesity/Physical Activity	232		232	N	N	N	1	Healthier	51
A16	Health Inequalities	100		100	N	N	N	1	Healthier	51
A16	Workforce development	25		25	N	N	N	1	Healthier	51
A16	Redesign through collaboration		580	580	Y	N	N	1	Healthier	51

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
A17	Sexual Health Transformation		500	500	Y	Y	N	1	Healthier	59
B	Supporting People									
B2	Individual service users will no longer receive a service in their own homes and some will need to be decanted from accommodation based services.		1,200	1,200	Y	N	N	2	Healthier/ Safer stronger	67
F	Business Support and Customer Transformation – Appendix 3									
F2a	Improve our online offer, starting with environmental services.	148		148	N	N	Y	3	Public Accounts	73
F2b	Pushing customers to self-serve online wherever possible.		52	52	N	N	Y	3	Public Accounts	73
F3	Customer Service Centre reorganisation.	130	43	173	N	N	Y	3	Public Accounts	77
G	Income Generation									
G2	Commercial Opportunities: Increase advertising income	300		300	N	N	N	4	Public Accounts	83
G2	Wireless Concessions: Explore potential to install wireless connections in street furniture using a concession licence in exchange for income.	200		200	N	N	N	4	Public Accounts	83
G2	Review of regulatory restrictions for the HRA, DSG and Capital Programme and review of treasury management	300		300	N	N	N	4	Public Accounts	83

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
G2	Increase sundry debt collection.	250		250	N	N	N	4	Public Accounts	83
G2	Parking: Review service level arrangements.		250	250	N	Y	Y	4	Public Accounts	83
H	Enforcement and Regulation									
H2	Further reductions in Crime, Enforcement and Regulation and Environmental Health		1,200	1,200	Y	N	Y	5	Safer Stronger	91
I	Management and Corporate Overheads									
I2a	Policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence		180	180	N	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	99
I2b	Senior management executive support	100		100	N	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	99
I2c	Governance		75	75	N	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	99
I3	Reorganisation of how Complaints are managed across the Council.	50		50	N	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	107
I4a	Review of Programmes in Strategy and Mayor and Cabinet Office	150		150	N	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	111
I4b	Restructure of Communications after voluntary redundancies	60		60	N	N	N	6	Public Accounts	111

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
I5	Commissioning and Procurement: undertake base lining of current activity and focus time only on value add activities.	500	500	1,000	Y	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	115
I6	Insurance and Risk: review liabilities and re-charge premiums to ensure they are contributing for the whole risk, not just direct costs.	300		300	N	N	N	6	Public Accounts	119
I7	Finance non-salary budget and vacancies review	100	150	250	N	N	N	6	Public Accounts	123
I8	Minor reorganisation of Legal Services to incorporate Procurement function	50		50	N	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	127
I9a	HR support	20	200	220	N	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	131
I9b	TU Secondments	40		40	N	N	Y	6	Public Accounts	131
I9c	Graduate Schemes	40		40	N	N	N	6	Public Accounts	131
I9d	Social Care Training		100	100	N	N	N	6	Public Accounts	131
I9e	Realign Schools HR Recharge	100		100	N	N	N	6	Public Accounts	131
I10a	Revising infrastructure support arrangements and Contract, systems and supplies review	1,000	1,000	2,000	Y	N	N	6	Public Accounts	135

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
I10b	Committee Papers: move to digital access only	100		100	N	N	N	6	Public Accounts	135
J	School Effectiveness									
J2a	Schools SLA: Apply an above inflation 2.5% increase to schools SLAs.	100		100	N	N	N	7	CYP	143
J2b	Attendance and Welfare: We currently deliver our core statutory offer plus some traded services within this area. A further restructure and increase in traded services could result in further savings.	150		150	Y	N	N	7	CYP	143
J2c	Schools Infrastructure: Schools Strategic IT support to be traded or withdrawn.	118		118	N	N	N	7	CYP	143
J2d	Educational Psychologists: Service reorganisation and further trading where possible.	5		5	N	N	N	7	CYP	143
J2e	Estates Management: Service re-organisation, improved coordination with property services, and reduced provision for property consultancy services.	220		220	N	N	Y	7	CYP	143
J2f	Free School Meals Eligibility: Service transfer to Customer Services financial assessments team.	17		17	N	N	Y	7	CYP	143
J2g	Management Restructure of the Standards and Achievement team.	50		50	N	N	Y	7	CYP	143

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
K	Drug and Alcohol									
K4	Reducing the length of time that methadone (Heroin substitute) is prescribed, re-procurement of the main drug and alcohol service, and greater use of community rehabilitation	50	340	390	Y	N	N	8	Safer Stronger	153
L	Culture and Community Services									
L5	Reduce the level of grant funding to the voluntary sector by £1,000,000 from 1 April 2017/18. This is the final year of the current main grants programme and will require the reduction/removal of funding from a range of organisations currently receiving funding.		1,000	1,000	Y	Y	N	9	Safer Stronger	159
L6	Library and Information Service: 1. Creation of three Hub Libraries – Deptford Lounge, Lewisham and Downham Health & Leisure Centre – which will carry an enhanced role for face to face contact between the Local Authority and the public to support the digital by default agenda. 2. the extension of the Lewisham Community Library Model to Forest Hill, Torrison, and Manor House, in partnership with other council services and community organisations. And the integration of the library provision into the repurposed ground floor space within the Catford complex (Laurence	400	600	1,000	Y	Y	Y	9	Safer Stronger	163

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
	House). 3. the regrading of front line staff to include new functions through the re-training and enhancement of front line roles.									
L7	Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services		1,000	1,000	Y	Y	N	9	Safer Stronger	179
M	Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services									
M2a	Review of funding streams across housing strategy, development and partnership functions	140		140	N	N	Y	10	Housing	185
M2b	Reduction in premises costs	60		60	N	N	N	10	Housing	185
N	Environmental Services									
N3	Review of Lewisham's Waste Services (Doorstep collection & disposal) Transfer of estates Bulky Waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes	600	500	1,100	Y	Y	Y	11	Sustainable	191
N4	Provide a mobile, 'as required', response service for residential roads instead of traditional 'beat cased' sweeper.	1,000		1,000	Y	Y	Y	11	Sustainable	199
N5	Review of Lewisham's Passenger Transport Service.	500	500	1,000	Y	Y	Y	11	Sustainable	205

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
N6	To develop our Trade Waste customer base, improve efficiency and increase income. To negotiate an increased share of income from Parks Events.	250	250	500	Y	Y	N	11	Sustainable	211
O	Public Services									
O4	Financial Assessments: Introduce standardisation and efficiencies in approach to financial assessments.	100		100	N	N	Y	12	Public Accounts	217
O5	Discretionary Freedom Pass: Option 1: Withdrawal of discretionary scheme.	200		200	Y	Y	N	12	Public Accounts	221
	Option 2: Close scheme to new applicants	20	20	40						
P	Planning and Economic Development									
P2a	Restructure of Development Management team and restructure and amalgamation of the Conservation, Urban Design and Planning Policy teams.	185		185	Y	N	Y	13	Sustainable	231
P2b	Substitution of part of base budget by alternative funding sources (S.106 and fee income).	45		45	Y	N	N	13	Sustainable	231
P2c	Further increase in charges and changes to funding coupled with savings achievable from a corporate approach to and restructure of employment services.		305	305	Y	N	Y	13	Sustainable	231

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
P2d	Review of Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on the way in which the service consults on planning applications. Efficiency savings based on paper, printing and postage costs.		20	20	Y	Y	N	13	Sustainable	231
Q	Safeguarding and Early Intervention									
Q3a & b	Sensory Teachers (a and b)	250		250	N	N	N	14	CYP	239
Q3c	Educational Psychologists: Further reduction in staffing through not replacing staff	35		35	N	N	Y	14	CYP	239
Q3d	Occupational Therapy – management reorganisation	50		50	N	N	Y	14	CYP	239
Q3e	Reduce Carers funding	40		40	N	N	N	14	CYP	239
Q3f	Review of MAPP portage with increased health contribution.	120		120	N	N	N	14	CYP	239
Q3g	Joint commissioning with efficiencies through reorganisation and better planning of work.	50		50	N	N	N	14	CYP	239
Q4a	Social care supplies and services reduced spend.	130	240	370	Y	N	N	14	CYP	247
Q4b	Social care financial management through continued cost control on all areas of spend.	50	50	100	N	N	N	14	CYP	247
Q4c	Placements: continuing strategy to use local authority foster placements where possible.		200	200	N	N	N	14	CYP	247

Ref.	Description	16/17 £'000	17/18 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Appendix	Scrutiny Committee	Page Number
Q5	Youth Service: accelerate tapering of support to Youth Service to statutory minimum (will follow decision on creation of a mutual).	150	150	300	Y	N	N	14	CYP	253