

Public Document Pack

Select Committee Agenda

September 2016
Civic Suite
Lewisham Town Hall
London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Overview and Scrutiny (02083149455)

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

Part 1

Item	Pages
Lewisham Future Programme	1 - 162

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY COMMITTEES			
Report Title	Lewisham Future Programme 2017/18 Revenue Budget Savings Report – September 2016		
Key Decision	No	Item	Supplement
Ward	All wards		
Contributors	Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration		
Class	Part 1	September 2016	

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1. To set out the officer revenue budget savings proposals that need to be scrutinised to enable the preparation of a balanced budget for 2017/18. These proposals, with comments from scrutiny, will be put forward to Mayor and Cabinet on the 28 September 2016.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1. The Council's net General Fund budget for 2016/17 is £236m. This is based on using reserves for the third consecutive year to balance the budget and follows two years of Directorate spending finishing the year overspending, in part due to the delivery of savings becoming harder.
- 2.2. To put the Council's finances on a sustainable footing, the Medium Term Financial Strategy identifies the need for £45m of ongoing savings in the three years to 2019/20, at £15m per year. However, this remains an estimate pending confirmation of any policy, funding, or wider implications from the change of Prime Minister and European Referendum decision in June.
- 2.3. This is also in addition to £17.4m savings already identified and agreed for 2017/18 (Please see section 11). In total this would bring the total savings made in the ten year period 2010 to 2020 to £200m.
- 2.4. Through the Lewisham Future Programme approach officers have worked hard to identify possible new savings proposals to meet the £45m target over the three years to 2019/20. In so doing, targets by work strand have been set on a differential basis to protect front-line services where possible.
- 2.5. The detail presented in this report identifies potential savings proposals from officers of £21m. By work strand these are:

Savings proposals	17/18	18/19	19/20	Total	Target	Gap
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000

Savings proposals	17/18	18/19	19/20	Total	Target	Gap
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
A - Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	2,000	1,650	2,450	6,100	11,000	-4,900
B - Supporting People	500	0	0	500	500	0
E - Asset rationalisation	300	1,050	525	1,875	8,000	-6,125
I - Management & corporate overhead	250	910	1,760	2,920	7,000	-4,080
J - School effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1,000	-1,000
K - Drugs & alcohol	0	0	0	0	500	-500
L- Culture & community services	380	390	0	770	2,000	-1,230
M - Strategic housing	546	350	0	896	1,500	-604
N Environment services	0	250	1,850	2,100	4,000	-1,900
O - Public Services	0	0	1,870	1,870	2,500	-630
P - Planning & economic development	0	240	40	280	1,000	-720
Q - Early intervention & safeguarding	2,793	150	100	3,043	6,000	-2,957
Proposals	6,769	4,990	8,595	20,354	45,000	-24,646
Target	15,480	14,910	14,610	45,000		
Gap	-8,711	-9,920	-6,015	-24,646		

- 2.6. Proformas are provided for those savings relating to 2017/18 except where stated otherwise. In some instances where the actions for 2017/18 roll into the subsequent years these savings are included in the proforma too. These require decision in 2016/17 to help build the budget for 2017/18.
- 2.7. Proposals for the later savings will be brought forward in due course for member scrutiny and decision. This will be to allow work to continue on delivering services at the same time as work progresses to implement the savings agreed, and identify how further changes can best be delivered to reduce the Council's costs.
- 2.8. In addition, given the scale of the gap still to be covered, further savings still need to be identified for all years. As such the report notes there is over £15m of current expenditure in areas where there is discretion but no proposals at present. This spend will be kept under review.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1. Members are invited to scrutinise and note the direction of travel and areas of anticipated savings for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20 as set out in this report.
- 3.2. Members are invited to scrutinise the detailed proposals in Appendices i to vi and provide feedback to the Mayor ahead of the Mayor & Cabinet meeting on the 28 September 2016. These are for the savings totalling £7.0m and referenced:
- A18 a & b; A19; A20; A21 a & b
 - E6; E7
 - I11 a & b
 - L8; L9; L10
 - M4; M5; M6; M7 a & b
 - Q6 a to f; Q7 a & b; Q8; Q9; Q10; Q11 a & b
- 3.3. Members are asked to note the previously agreed savings tabled in section 11 which are to be presented to the Mayor for noting and re-endorsement.
- 3.4. Members are asked to note the update on progress in relation to Public Health savings provided in section 12.
- 3.5. Members are invited to scrutinise the draft efficiency plan at Appendix xi to enable the Council to accept the four year settlement offer in respect of Revenue Support Grant for the years 2016/17 to 2019/20.

4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

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

Section	Title
1	Purpose of the report
2	Executive summary
3	Recommendations
4	Structure of the report
5	Financial Context
6	Lewisham Future Programme Approach
7	Principles
8	Lewisham 2020
9	Savings
10	Other Areas
11	Previously Agreed Savings

12	Public Health Savings Update
13	Timetable
14	Financial implications
15	Legal implications
16	Conclusion
17	Background documents
	Appendices

5. FINANCIAL CONTEXT

- 5.1. The Council has a General Fund budget for the current financial year, 2016/17, of £236m. This budget is under pressure from the need to deliver services within this level of financial resource and identify further savings.
- 5.2. In the six years between 2010/11 and 2015/16 the Council made savings of £120m and halved its workforce. For the two years 2016/17 and 2017/18 a further £35m of savings have been agreed by Mayor & Cabinet. Looking forward the Council anticipates having to identify a further £45m of savings to 2019/20, or £15m in each year 2017/18, 2018/19, and 2019/20. This will bring the total of savings from the General Fund to £200m over ten years.
- 5.3. In 2015/16 the Council ended the financial year with a Directorate overspending position in the region of £6m with the largest pressures being in the areas of Looked After Children, Temporary Accommodation, and No Recourse to Public Funds. These pressures arise from a combination of the:
- Impact of government policy changes;
 - Demand pressures as the population of Lewisham grows; and
 - Difficulties in delivering agreed savings with the full financial impact.
- 5.4. In setting the 2016/17 budget over £3m of corporate risk monies were added to the Directorate base to help align budgets to the persistent areas of spending pressure and reserves were required for the third consecutive year to set a balanced budget.
- 5.5. In July 2016, following the EU referendum, the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) was presented to members. This referenced a number of risks resulting from the outcome, the likelihood and impacts of which remain uncertain. The main risks are in the areas of:
- government policy and funding changes;
 - changes for London via the devolution agenda;
 - employment and business impacting local tax take; and
 - wider social implications resulting from the above.

6. LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME APPROACH

- 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 Corporate Savings Principles agreed in 2010 (see Appendix ix), the elected administration's manifesto commitments, and its emerging political priorities for the savings.
- 6.2. The Council continues to approach the task of identifying savings around the thematic and service areas agreed in the Programme. Looking at the three years to 2019/20, considering the finances available, growth and other pressures on Council Services the Medium Term Financial Strategy identifies further savings of £45m are required, representing a reduction of approximately 20% over the three years.
- 6.3. As in previous years, the Lewisham Future Programme continues to try and protect front line services where possible. For this reason the allocation of savings targets has been weighted to best protect key services such as social care and take more from the corporate and administrative functions and where there may be more opportunity for income generation. The savings targets for the £45m by work strand are:

Work strand and savings target as % of net General Fund budget		£m	%
A	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	-11.0	-13%
B	Supporting people	-0.5	-6%
E	Asset rationalisation	-8.0	-81%
H	Enforcement & regulation	-0.0	-0%
I	Management & corporate overheads	-7.0	-28%
J	School effectiveness	-1.0	-78%
K	Crime reduction	-0.5	-25%
L	Culture & community services	-2.0	-17%
M	Housing strategy & non-HRA services	-1.5	-23%
N	Environmental services	-4.0	-20%
O	Public services	-2.5	-16%
P	Planning & economic development	-1.0	-77%
Q	Safeguarding & early intervention services	-6.0	-10%
	Total	-45.0	-19%

- 6.4. A change for this savings cycle has been not to set targets in the cross-cutting areas, such as business and customer transformation (digital), shared services, income generation, etc.. This is to avoid duplicate work and the risk of double counting. This does not mean work in these areas stops, indeed these areas are the focus of the Lewisham 2020 approach set by members (see below).

- 6.5. Savings identified by these enabling approaches will be tracked but with the main financial monitoring continuing via the service budgets. This is to ensure that the Council has a direct view and understanding of where savings are being taken from budgets and that the responsible budget holders are clear on the budgets they have and are responsible for managing within. As a result there are no C, D, F or G work strands in the report.
- 6.6. In addition to the oversight work of the Lewisham Future Programme Board, the Chief Executive and Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration have been holding a number of challenge sessions with those areas with the largest targets. They are:

Work strand		£m	%
A	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	-11.0	-13%
E	Asset rationalisation	-8.0	-81%
I	Management & corporate overheads	-7.0	-28%
N	Environmental services	-4.0	-20%
Q	Safeguarding & early intervention services	-6.0	-10%

- 6.7. The focus of the savings has to be on the net General Fund budget as this is the subject of the statutory requirement for the Council to set a balanced budget. However, in respect of the Lewisham 2020 transformation enablers it is also important to look at the full (gross) scale of activity to effectively change operational models and culture through different ways of working. This further highlights where the scale of the Council's activity is and where there are more opportunities to re-shape, rather than stop services, while delivering the savings required.

7. PRINCIPLES

- 7.1. As noted above, the proposals are presented by Lewisham Future Programme thematic work strand. They have been developed with regard to the nine savings principles defined by the Council to take a one Council view (avoid cost shunting), build for sustainable options where possible, and be equitable by putting the customer first.
- 7.2. Savings are presented in the context of the budget and scope of the service areas in each work strand. The savings are presented as (although not in this order) 1) those proposals officers are progressing, 2) those proposals which need further member input and decisions to progress, and 3) those areas under review but further work is required before savings can be proposed with certainty.
- 7.3. To facilitate tracking of the individual proposals, as was done last year, the referencing used by Lewisham Future Programme work strand is the same and the numbering continues on from the 2015/16 and 2016/17 proposals.

8. LEWISHAM 2020

8.1. The savings proposals will also be assessed through the lens of the enabling approaches, set out in the Lewisham 2020 strategy, to help with monitoring how the savings and service changes are delivered. They are:

- Creating the conditions where communities will be able to support themselves;
- Actively exploring all opportunities to share services;
- Digitising our services and our interactions with residents (to help simplify and manage demand); and
- Developing entrepreneurial approaches to income generation, particularly in relation to assets.

8.2. The table below summarises examples of savings made to date and proposed (as set out in this report) by Lewisham 2020 transformation theme. Those areas of activity to date are still relevant as work continues to extend these practices, as well as identify new efficiencies.

Transformation theme	Examples – to date	Examples - proposed
Communities supporting themselves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of successful community libraries • Volunteer engagement to maintain parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Local Assemblies to self-manage • Engage tenants to support handy person service
Sharing Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared operation support with other London Boroughs – IT & Comms • Employment and Skills training cross Borough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment fleet and depot services in South East London • Co-location of offices with partners – e.g. CCG
Digitising services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Citrix infrastructure and paperless office plans • Channel shift to bring more services on-line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing workforce practices to more flexible working – e.g. social work • Embed channel shift and increase automation
Managing demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More home support to lower health & care costs • Recruitment of more local foster parents • Work to support self-travel to limit transport demands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend personal budgets to lessen need for support • Focus through contracts on prevention support • Extend extra care and shared lives schemes
Income generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop own enforcement agency re debt collection • Offer extended services – e.g. trade waste, green recycling, pre-planning etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invest in developing housing supply – e.g. PRS, short-term & hostels • Improve timely and efficient debt collection

8.3. In addition to the approaches noted above, the level of savings required continues to require work on cost control in all areas (e.g. use of agency staff,

contract management, etc..) and an acceptance of more service and financial risk through leaner corporate governance, risk and control arrangements.

9. SAVINGS

9.1. The savings presented in overview in this section all relate to the new savings required of £45m by 2019/20, expected at £15m per year. They are presented by work strand.

9.2. A Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
103.3	-32.8	70.5	-11.0

Scope

9.3. The largest part of this area's spend relates to the delivery of Adult Social Care services, which offer a range of care and support services to help frail, disabled and other vulnerable adults to remain independent, active and safe. Support is provided in their own homes, in a community setting or in a care home. Also important to the success of this area is the work with partners on shaping local health services and support for the health of the local population.

9.4. This work strand now excludes changes to Public Health funding (including early years health visiting) as the ongoing annual reductions of this grant to 2019/20 are being managed separately to keep spending in line with available grant (see section 12 below).

Savings

9.5. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

9.5.1. **A18** - Widening the scope for charging - £0.5m in 2017/18

- Clarify charging arrangements, ensuring they are robust and equitable
- Invoice for services right first time (right amount from the right person)
- Improve collection of income (e.g. use of direct debits and chasing promptly)

9.5.2. **A19** - Workforce productivity from better use of technology - £0.5m by 2018/19

- Review approaches to managing demand at the front door, more mobile working, and more integrated working with health partners.

9.6. The following areas are being considered that may require member approval to consult on policy or service changes as a result of restructuring.

- 9.6.1. **A20** - Reduction in day care offer - £0.9m by 2019/20
 - Review social isolation risks and signpost people to more generic services that would be self-funded
- 9.6.2. **A21** - Review levels of Mental Health expenditure - £1.2m by 19/20
 - Review placement and possible services restructure as part of review of current South London and Maudsley contracts.

9.7. In addition, work continues in the following areas to identify the potential opportunities to bring forward further savings, by 2019/20 if possible but all longer dated at present. They are:

- 9.7.1. Further integration work with Health - £2.0m by 2019/20
 - Continue to the work to advance the pace and scope of integration of health and social care activities to reduce costs across the piece
- 9.7.2. Reduce Transport spend - £0.5m in 2019/20
 - As part of the ongoing work to reduce the over spend in this area and deliver £1m of savings, opportunities to further remove routes and meet need in other ways will continue to be explored.
- 9.7.3. Extend use of extra care to avoid higher cost placements - £0.5m by 2019/20
 - Enhance Shared Lives to reduce costs associated with respite and long term care for people with learning difficulties.
 - Increase extra care and supported living units for complex service users that would otherwise move to high cost placements.

Risks

9.8. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings will be to ensure the equitable provision of services going forward, the ability to work with and negotiate with health partners to direct joint funding to social care, and embed the cultural changes necessary to release the productivity gains from investment in new ways of working.

Summary

9.9. The potential savings for work strand A – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

A - Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
--	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	--------------	---------------------	--------------------

A - Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
A18 a) – Widening the scope for charging by removing subsidy and increasing charges	200			200	N	Y	N
A18 b) – Widening the scope for charging by improving income collection performance	300			300	N	N	N
A19 - Workforce productivity from better use of technology	200	300		500	Y	N	N
A20 - Reduction in day care offer	300	300	300	900	Y	N	N
A21 a) - Review levels of Mental Health expenditure, manage demand for accommodation services	300	300	400	1,000	N	N	N
A21 b) - Review levels of Mental Health expenditure, review implementation of s117 requirements	200			200	N	N	N
Further Integration – proposal currently being developed	500	500	1,000	2,000			
Reduce Transport spend			500	500			
Increase extra care, shared lives & supported living placements		250	250	500			
Total	2,000	1,780	2,450	6,230			
Target	3,700	3,700	3,600	11,000			
Gap	-1,700	-1,920	-1,150	-4,770			

9.10. Please see appendix i for the saving proformas A18 to A21.

9.11. B – Supporting People

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
18.9	-9.1	9.8	-0.5

Scope

- 9.12. The service is focused on supporting those vulnerable people who are working to overcome addiction, the impact of violence or mental health issues to help them get back into main stream support.

Savings

- 9.13. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

- 9.13.1. **B3** Service procurement - £0.5m in 2017/18 (see further explanation below)

Risks

- 9.14. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings will be the effective commissioning and procurement of services.

Summary

- 9.15. The potential savings for work strand B – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

B – Supporting People	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
*B3 Re-procure floating support services	500			500	N	N	N
Total	500	0	0	500			
Target	500	0	0	500			
Gap	0	0	0	0			

*No proforma is attached as this saving is in progress so this is an update of work in progress and not a new saving. However, for completeness in terms of setting the budget for 2017/18 it does need to be noted.

In Feb 2015 Mayor and Cabinet agreed to:

- re-commissioning the floating support services to deliver savings across a number of contracts. Due to partnership working with Lewisham Homes

and the other Registered Social Landlord providers in the borough the overall saving has been greater than anticipated.

- the re-commissioning of the Young Person Assessment Centre achieved additional savings due to a change in the model and the market conditions for this type of service. The quality of provision has been maintained.
- Reduced support for supported accommodation provision for mental health. It was agreed that funding for services that the Local Authority had previously jointly commissioned in respect of Mental health was to be funded wholly by mental health provider through their offsetting of procurement efficiencies and would not impact on service delivery overall.

In addition:

- Further reductions have been delivered through low level efficiencies across a range of contracts due to market conditions and an impending restructure of the commissioning team.

9.16. **E Asset rationalisation**

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
15.8	-8.2	7.6	-8.0

Scope

- 9.17. This service works to renew the physical fabric of the borough, sustainably and to enhance the overall well-being of Lewisham as a place. This is managed through programme management capital delivery, school place expansion programme, town centre regeneration, asset strategy, contract management, maintenance of the corporate estate (including investment assets), and transport (including highways improvement and lighting).

Savings

- 9.18. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to bringing forward revenue streams or tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

9.18.1. **E6** - Property investment acquisition - £0.15m by 2019/20

- Invest in addressing housing supply pressures – for example in the private rented and short-term alternatives for temporary accommodation.

9.18.2. Co-location as part of partnership working - £0.5m by 2019/20

- Accommodation of Health and Job Centre Plus teams in Laurence House provides contribution to overheads.

9.19. The following areas are being considered that may require member approval to consult on policy or service changes as a result of restructuring.

9.19.1. **E7** - Development of Private Rental Schemes – £1.0m by 2019/20

- For example; Besson Street, Achilles Street, Catford

9.19.2. Re-provision hostel accommodation - £0.2m by 2019/20

- Commission purpose built provision to then release existing residential street sites and secure gain on the capital receipts.

9.20. In addition, work continues in the following areas to identify the potential opportunities to bring forward further savings, by 2019/20 if possible but all longer dated at present. They are:

9.20.1. Development of regeneration schemes - £3.0m post 2019/20

- As part of current plans the next phases for Ladywell, Wearside, Achilles Street, and Catford
- Work on potential at sites such as Hamilton Street, Sayes Court, Clare Court, Perry Vale car park, Home Park and Bell Green, and Vanguard Street car park.
- Final parts of investment and hostels proposals noted above.

Risks

9.21. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings will be the ability to appraise, design, procure, partner and deliver these proposals in an appropriate timeframe at an affordable cost (in terms of the required capital commitments to realise proportionate revenue income or savings).

Summary

9.22. The potential savings for work strand E – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

E – Asset Rationalisation	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
E6 - Property investment acquisition	150			150	N	N	N
E7 - Development of Private Rental Schemes	150	700	175	1,025	N	N	N
Co-location as part of partnership working		250	250	500			
Re-provision hostel accommodation		100	100	200			
Total	300	1,050	525	1,875			

E – Asset Rationalisation	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
Target	2,700	2,700	2,600	8,000			
Gap	-2,400	-1,650	-2,075	-6,125			

9.23. Please see appendix ii for the saving proformas E6 and E7.

9.24. H Enforcement & regulation

9.25. No savings target has been set for this area following the major reorganisation and change of approach to an intelligence led and targeted response service in 2015/16. Some aspects of this service, in particular food standards, are subject to external inspection and the approach now in place has to be proven before further risk from a more selective response approach are considered.

9.26. I Management & corporate overheads

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
42.8	-17.8	25.0	-7.0

Scope

9.27. The services included within this work strand include the corporate and democratic core, the cost of members and senior management, and the corporate administrative services that help coordinate and support the externally focused work in Directorates. These services include: Human Resources; Legal and Electoral Services; Corporate Resources; Finance; Policy, Performance and Governance; and Strategy.

Savings

9.28. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

9.28.1. **I11** - Review insurance risk assessments - £0.3m by 2018/19

- Review risk assessments to reduce costs, in part by taking on more self-insured risk (current general fund budget £1.5m per year).

9.28.2. Reduction in staffing and operational budgets in the governance, secretariat, policy & performance teams - £0.32m by 2019/20

- Reduce the level of governance support
- Reduce secretariat support for officers
- Reduce policy and performance support

9.28.3. Reduction in finance function - £0.5m by 2019/20

- Reorganisation of the function and reduction in service levels to Directorates to focus on key statutory roles (e.g. the financial statements) and other returns.

9.28.4. Review level of external legal spend - £0.2m in 2018/19

- Review all external legal spend to assess where costs on specialists could be reduced by extending and backing in-house team judgements.

9.28.5. Review leadership and management requirements - £0.15m in 2018/19

- Review senior officer arrangements in light of changes to Council services.

9.29. The following areas are being considered that may require member approval to consult on policy or service changes as a result of restructuring.

9.29.1. Reduction Trade Union and Learning and Development costs - £0.2m by 2019/20

- Stop non-employee adult social care learning to the voluntary and private sectors
- Reduce level of Trade Union secondments in parallel with further reductions in employee numbers.

9.29.2. Reduction in work of Strategy team – £0.25m in 2019/20

- Carry out a review of functions and staffing across the strategy and communications areas to be implemented in 2019/20.

9.29.3. Commercialise ICT shared service arrangements – £1.0m in 2019/20

- Use the benefit of recent infrastructure investments and working with the London Borough of Brent to offer current ICT support arrangements to other local authorities on a commercial basis.

Risks

9.30. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings will be to ensure Council business is covered satisfactorily, undue risk and cost shunts do not arise, and statutory obligations continue to be met in full. These risks are now particularly acute in the area of management and corporate overheads as the Council has front loaded savings since 2010/11 to these corporate support functions to protect front line services.

Summary

9.31. The savings being proposed for work strand I – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

I – Management & corporate overheads	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
I11 a) - Review insurance risks & reserves	225	50		275	N	N	N
I11 b) - Review insurance risks and reorganise	25			25	N	N	N
Reduce the level of governance support		50	50	100			
Reduce secretariat support		60	60	120			
Reduce policy & performance support		100		100			
Reduction in finance function		200	300	500			
Review level of external legal spend		200		200			
Review leadership & management arrangements		150		150			
Reduction in Trade Union costs and external social care learning & dev.		100	100	200			
Reduction in work of Strategy team			250	250			
Commercialise ICT shared service arrangements			1,000	1,000			
Total	250	910	1,760	2,920			
Target	2,400	2,300	2,300	7,000			
Gap	-2,150	-1,390	-540	-4,080			

9.32. Please see appendix iii for the saving proforma for I11.

9.33. J School effectiveness

9.34. A savings target of £1m has been set for this area of activity. While it is not anticipated that the Council's statutory duties for schools, and particularly safeguarding within them, would be removed there was a national expectation that all schools should become Academies. This would have fundamentally changed the relationship and level of engagement the Council could expect to have with schools, and the related costs or recharges appropriate for this work. However, the government's policy to require academisation has subsequently changed again. Future funding levels are also expected to change from 2017/18, through both Education Support Grant and Formula Funding, but the details are still to be confirmed. At the same time the Council

has commissioned an Education Commission to review its approach to this area.

9.35. Given the strategic uncertainties in this area no firm proposals are presented at this time. Work will continue in this area and proposals will be brought forward when the structural and funding position for future years is clearer.

9.36. **K Drugs and alcohol**

9.37. A savings target of £0.5m has been set for this area. However, given the overlap with decisions on public health spending and reliance on London Mayoral funding, no proposals are being put forward at this stage pending agreement on the approach to keep public health spending within the level of the grant and more detail on Greater London Authority spending plans.

9.38. Once the wider funding position is clearer the feasibility of achieving this target will be reviewed.

9.39. **L Culture & community services**

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
19.0	-7.6	11.4	-2.0

Scope

9.40. The service area is responsible for libraries, arts and entertainment, adult education, community/neighbourhood development (including grants programme) and leisure, sports and recreation activities.

Savings

9.41. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

9.41.1. **L8** - Facilities management - £0.2m by 2018/19

- Review arrangements for the management of some Division's operational buildings and seek third party provider(s) to take on the role.

9.42. The following areas are being considered that may require member approval to consult on policy or service changes as a result of restructuring.

9.42.1. **L9** – Restructure the Assemblies fund - £0.27m in 2017/18

- End the annual £15k per ward but retain officer support to assist with coordinating voluntary support and activities and look to replace with alternative funding where possible.

9.42.2. Withdraw subsidies - £0.3m by 2018/19

- **L10** - End residual £40k funding to Adult Learning Lewisham so fully funded by the Skills Funding Agency
- Review remaining Leisure subsidies (following contract review savings agreed for 2016/17) to exit from them.
- Revisit objectives and £60k support for People’s Day and Blackheath fireworks.

Risks

9.43. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings will be the loss of presence and goodwill in the community for creating value through underpinning and supporting the sense of place in Lewisham.

Summary

9.44. The savings being proposed for work strand L – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

L – Culture and Community Services	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
L8 - Facilities management	70	130		200	N	N	Y
L9 - Assemblies Fund	270			270	Y	Y	N
L10 - Adult Learning Lewisham subsidy	40			40	N	N	N
Leisure services subsidy		200		200			
Events subsidy		60		60			
Total	380	390	0	770			
Target	700	700	600	2,000			
Gap	-320	-310	-600	-1,230			

9.45. Please see appendix iv for savings proformas L8 to L10 and an Equality Impact assessment report for L9.

9.46. **M Housing strategy & non-HRA services**

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
25.7	-20.2	5.5	-1.5

Scope

9.47. This division includes the following service areas: housing strategy and programmes; housing needs (including housing options and homesearch); and private sector housing agency.

Savings

9.48. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

9.48.1. Service restructures to improve joint working - £0.4m by 2019/20

- **M3** - Housing needs to integrate HOC and SHIP working and co-locate teams
- Integrate No Recourse to Public Funds and Homeless Prevention service working
- Restructure grants and occupational therapy services

9.48.2. Reduce No Recourse to Public Funds administration costs - £0.2m by 2018/19

- **M7** - Review approaches to managing demand at the front door and assessment and monitoring of casework.

9.49. The following areas are being considered that may require member approval to consult on policy or service changes as a result of restructuring.

9.49.1. Income generating projects - £0.24m in 2017/18

- **M4** - Place Ladywell
- **M5** - Hamilton Lodge hostel accommodation

9.49.2. Handy Persons Service - £0.15m in 2017/18

- Engage with the community and tenants to reorganise provision of the current Handy Persons service for tenants.

9.50. In addition, work continues in the following areas to identify the potential and opportunities to bring forward further savings before 2019/20. They are:

9.50.1. Other income generating schemes

- **M6** - For example, and depending on the capital costs required, further pop up schemes at Mayfield or on a Council car park

Risks

9.51. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings are to address current pressures on No Recourse to Public Funds, Temporary Accommodation and an income shortfall on private sector leasing services while also delivering savings. The restructuring savings are dependent on suitable office

accommodation being found and capital costs for income generating schemes being affordable.

Summary

- 9.52. The savings being proposed for work strand M – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

M – Strategic Housing	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
*M3 - Housing needs restructure	61			61			
M4 – PLACE / Ladywell	85			85	N	N	N
M5 - Hamilton Lodge hostel income	150			150	N	N	N
M6 - Reorganise provision of the Handy Persons service	150			150	Y	Y	Y
M7 a) - Reduce No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) re-provisioning housing	64			64	N	N	N
M7 b) – NRPF prompt claiming of Housing Benefit project	36			36	N	N	N
Co-locate HOC and SHIP services		200		200			
Restructure NRPF and Homeless prevention services		100		100			
Restructure grants and OT services		50		50			
Total	546	350	0	896			
Target	500	500	500	1,500			
Gap	46	-150	-500	-604			

*No proforma is attached as this saving **M3** is in progress so this is an update of work in progress and not a new saving. However, for completeness in terms of setting the budget for 2017/18 it does need to be noted.

Mayor and Cabinet has agreed to transfer operational services focused on the management and maintenance of Temporary Accommodation (TA) to Lewisham Homes to maximise their operational expertise and enable the Council's housing team to play a more strategic role. This has been done and

a proposal to reorganise the Housing Needs team to align with these objectives is now being progressed by management. This is being done in line with the 'managing change' policy and will result in a £61k saving to the General Fund and £7k saving to the Housing Revenue Account.

9.53. Please see appendix v for saving proformas M4 to M7

9.54. **N Environmental services**

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
36.2	-17.3	18.9	-4.0

Scope

9.55. This division includes the following service areas: waste management (refuse and recycling); cleansing (street sweeping); Green Scene (parks and open spaces); fleet and passenger services; bereavement services, and markets.

Savings

9.56. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

9.56.1. Cost of maintaining Parks - £0.5m by 2019/20

- Combination of continued tight cost management and identifying new income generating opportunities.

9.57. In addition, work continues in the following areas to identify the potential and opportunities to bring forward further savings before 2019/20. They are:

9.57.1. Development of shared service - £1.6m in 2019/20

- Continue to explore South East London regional opportunities to realise economies of scale through sharing of depot and fleet management arrangements.

Risks

9.58. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings are risk appetite to using public spaces more commercially and alignment of commercial interests with neighbouring boroughs to facilitate the agreement of shared services arrangements in a short timeframe.

Summary

9.59. The savings being proposed for work strand N - are:

N – Environmental services	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
Parks income opportunities and cost savings		250	250	500			
South East London shared service arrangements for depot and fleet			1,600	1,600			
Total	0	250	1,850	2,100			
Target	1,300	1,300	1,400	4,000			
Gap	-1,300	-1,050	450	-1,900			

9.60. O Public services

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
17.2	-3.7	13.5	-2.5

Scope

9.61. This division provides the 'front door' to a wide range of services across the Council. This includes the Customer Contact Centre; Registration; Revenues; Benefits; Business Support; Emergency Planning; and Parking Management services.

Savings

9.62. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

9.62.1. Automation of online forms - £0.53m in 2019/20

- Digital work to automate the 15+ forms into the main Academy system
- Review options to further automate the business rates processes
- Move benefit claim process to online only
- Explore automation of the adult social care financial assessment process

9.62.2. Channel shift to online work - £0.32m by 2019/20

- Reduce telephone contacts (92,000 in 15/16) by moving 70% of transaction processing calls online.
- Shift significant proportion of remaining 30% of those who pay 'voluntarily' to direct debit or other automated payment methods.

9.62.3. Improve sundry debt collection processes - £1.0m from 2019/20

- Review and modernise approaches to debt collection to drive up income collection.

9.62.4. Contact centre system replacement - £0.02m from 2019/20

- Procure replacement contact centre system to provide greater resilience and improved functionality to support digital work.

Risks

9.63. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings are ability to educate and change user expectations and routes to engaging with the Council.

Summary

9.64. The savings being proposed for work strand O – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

O – Public Services	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
Automation of online forms			530	530			
Channel shift and demand management			320	320			
Improve sundry debt collection			1,000	1,000			
Contact system replacement			20	20			
Total	0	0	1,870	1,870			
Target	840	830	830	2,500			
Gap	-840	-830	1,040	-630			

9.65. **P Planning & economic development**

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
3.1	-1.7	1.4	-1.0

Scope

- 9.66. This division provides employment and business support for local businesses or those seeking to invest in Lewisham; maintenance of the local economic assessment; strategic leadership on business employment and the EU. Development and the use of land in the long term public interest are achieved through a positive and proactive approach to shaping, considering, determining, and delivering development proposals.

Savings

- 9.67. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

- 9.67.1. Organise to deliver income generating work - £0.2m from 2018/19
- Greater stability in the planning team by reducing reliance on agency staff.

- 9.67.2. Re-organisation of development management - £0.04m in 2018/19
- Restructure team to deliver planning functions

- 9.68. The following areas are being considered that may require member approval to consult on policy or service changes as a result of restructuring.

- 9.68.1. Review fee levels - £0.04m in 2019/20
- Review fees for Design Review Panel work to cover costs of post to support.

Risks

- 9.69. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings are tied to the performance of the London economy and the related demand for planning services that result. This could provide further opportunities for additional income, as much as the downside risk.

Summary

- 9.70. The savings being proposed for work strand P – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

P – Planning and economic development	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
Re-organise to reduce reliance on agency staff		200		200			
Restructure development management team		40		40			
Review fees for Design Panel Review work			40	40			
Total	0	240	40	280			
Target	340	330	330	1,000			
Gap	-340	-90	-290	-720			

9.71. Q Safeguarding & early intervention services

Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target to 2019/20 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
67.1	-19.5	47.6	-6.0

Scope

9.72. This work strand covers all Children's Social Care functions, including early intervention services such as Children's Centres and Targeted Family Support. The service works with children who need to be looked after and safeguarded from harm.

9.73. The work strand also includes the services to individual children with complex needs; those with special educational needs; the youth service; and the youth offending service and health care commissioning for children and young people.

Savings

9.74. The following areas are being reviewed by management with a view to tightening up procedures in line with existing policies to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:

- 9.74.1. **Q6** Developing alternative pathways for care for adoption, looked after children and those leaving care - £1.0m mainly in 2017/18
- Improved planning and support for independence skills provision for leaving care including increase of Personal Adviser capacity
 - Additional shared housing procurement for care leavers with NRPF

- Revised pathways and procurement to access public housing at 18 years old, including revised use of training flats
- 9.74.2. **Q7** Contact efficiencies or reduced spend - £0.25m
- In the area of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)
- 9.74.3. **Q8** Continue strategy to develop in-house fostering team and specialist carers - £0.16m in 2017/18
- Finalise fostering strategy currently in development and implement actions.
- 9.74.4. Reduction in looked after children by refocusing current arrangements - £0.7m in 2017/18
- **Q9** Enhance support for young people on the edge of care to avoid need to provide accommodation
 - **Q10** Enhance family finding capacity for step down placements, rather than using external residential providers.
- 9.75. The following areas are being considered that may require member approval to consult on policy or service changes as a result of restructuring.
- 9.75.1. Assessment intervention and spot purchase efficiency review - £0.7m
- This work to be aligned with digital transformation and workforce strategy review.
 - **Q11** Review of function and purpose of Meliot Road Centre whereby it will cease to operate as a Family Centre and will be re-focussed as a Contact Centre.
- 9.76. In addition, work continues in the following areas to identify the potential and opportunities to bring forward further savings before 2019/20. They are:
- 9.76.1. Developing own provision and seeking alternative funding
- For example in the areas of short breaks, providing own children's home(s), charging policies, and accessing the social care innovation fund.

Risks

- 9.77. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings are the ability to develop local authority provision at the levels needed to offer alternative pathways and support to avoid more expensive external provision. Also that with the introduction of change there is the risk of some breakdown of existing arrangements with negative consequences if not effectively managed.

Summary

- 9.78. The savings being proposed for work strand Q – are (those shaded are the ones with proforma in the appendices):

Q – Early intervention & safeguarding	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
Q6 a) - Developing alternative pathways for care – shared housing	170			170	Y	N	N
Q6 b) - Developing alternative pathways for care – housing support	420			420	Y	N	N
Q6 c) - Developing alternative pathways for care – access to public housing	500			500	Y	N	N
Q6 d) - Developing alternative pathways for care – claiming of housing benefit	270			270	Y	N	N
Q6 e) - Developing alternative pathways for care – contract monitoring	190			190	Y	N	N
Q6 f) - Developing alternative pathways for care – improved planning		100		100	Y	N	N
Q7 a) - Redesign Of Lewisham CAMHS – improve access pathways	44	50	100	194	Y	N	N
Q7 b) - Redesign Of Lewisham CAMHS – further integration work	50			50	Y	N	N
Q8 - Develop in-house fostering and specialist carers	220			220	Y	Y	N
Q9 - Enhance support for children on edge of care	495			495	Y	N	N
Q10 - Enhance family finding capacity for step down	150			150	Y	Y	N
Q11 a) - Redesign of Meliot Centre - review of services at the centre	500			500	Y	N	Y
Q11 b) - Redesign of Meliot Centre - develop contact centre	234			234	Y	N	N
Total	2,793	150	100	3,043			
Target	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000			
Gap	793	-1,850	-1,900	-2,957			

9.79. Please see appendix vi for savings proformas Q6 to Q11.

10. OTHER AREAS

Discretionary spend

- 10.1. In preparing the above there is over £15m of discretionary spend which has not been put forward for further consideration at this stage
- 10.2. This is in part as significant changes are currently being implemented to these areas so it is not the right time to consider future options until these have been fully implemented. At the same time these budgets are also for services key to Members priorities. However, with some minimum statutory obligations, these are discretionary services. So if the savings proposals presented here and to follow do not meet the level of savings necessary to set a balanced budget then these areas may also need to be revisited before 2019/20.

Four Year Efficiency Plan

- 10.3. In the annual financial settlement for 2016/17 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to all authorities to offer them a four year financial settlement. This settlement is still subject to an annual consultation and confirmation by parliament.
- 10.4. For Lewisham this relates to the offered level of Revenue Support Grant (RSG) each year to 2019/20. To take up this offer the Council must write to the Secretary of State by the 14 October 2016 and include a link to a published efficiency plan. The paper attached at Appendix xi draws on the Council's financial strategy, savings proposals and approach to transformation through the Lewisham Future Programme and Lewisham 2020 priorities.
- 10.5. Once approved by the Mayor it will become Lewisham's efficiency plan to 2019/20 to enable it to take the four year settlement of RSG worth £170.3m.

11. PREVIOUSLY AGREED SAVINGS

- 11.1. In November 2014 and September 2015, the Mayor agreed savings for 2017/18 totalling £17.4m. These are the savings tabled below and re-presented to the Mayor for noting and re-endorsement:

Previously Agreed 2017/18 Revenue Budget Savings Proposals

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	Status
A	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health		
A11	Managing and improving transition plans	300	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
A12	Reducing costs of staff management, assessment and care planning	200	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
A13	Alternative Delivery Models for the provision of care and support services, including mental health	700	Report to Scrutiny and M&C now scheduled for November 2016
A14	Achieving best value in care packages	500	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
A15	New delivery models for extra care – Provision of Contracts	900	Report to Scrutiny and M&C now scheduled for November 2016
A16	Health Protection	23	On track – see Public Health savings
A16	Redesign through collaboration	580	On track – see Public Health savings
A17	Sexual Health Transformation	500	On track – see Public Health savings
D	Efficiency Review		
D1	Annual reduction from inflation	2,500	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
E	Asset Optimisation		
E2	Efficiencies in facilities management contracts	670	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
E3	Additional income from corporate properties	200	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
E4	Additional income from commercial properties	100	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
E5	Energy efficiency measures	15	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
F	Business Support and Customer Transformation		
F1	Centralisation of business support services part 2	1,000	Work continues to develop next phase as part 1 changes in place
F2b	Pushing customers to self-serve online wherever possible.	52	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
F3	Customer Service Centre reorganisation.	43	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
G	Income Generation		
G2e	Parking: Review service level arrangements.	250	Ongoing and aligned with work around CPZs
I	Management and Corporate Overheads		
I2a	Policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence	180	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	Status
I2c	Governance	75	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
I5	Commissioning and Procurement: undertake base lining of current activity and focus time only on value add activities.	500	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
I7	Finance non-salary budget and vacancies review	150	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
I9a	HR support	200	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
I9d	Social Care Training	100	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
I10a	Revising infrastructure support arrangements and Contract, systems and supplies review	1,000	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
J	School Effectiveness		
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.	75	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
J2c	Schools Infrastructure: Schools Strategic IT support to be traded or stop	58	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
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	340	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
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 will require the reduction/removal of funding from a range of organisations currently receiving funding.	1,000	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
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	600	Savings being progressed, report presented to Mayor and Cabinet on the 13 July 2016. Arrangements for Manor House still to be finalised.

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	Status
	<p>Authority and the public to support the digital by default agenda.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>3. the regrading of front line staff to include new functions through the re-training and enhancement of front line roles.</p>		
L7	Change in contractual arrangements relating the leisure services	1,000	Report to Scrutiny and M&C now scheduled for September 2016
M	Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services		
M1	Feb 2015 saving – Non-housing stock transfer from Housing Revenue Account to General Fund	100	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
N	Environmental Services		
N3	Review of Lewisham's Waste Services (Doorstep collection & disposal) Transfer of estates Bulky Waste disposal costs to Lewisham Homes	500	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
N5	Review of Lewisham's Passenger Transport Service.	500	Work continues to develop firm approach
N6	To develop our Trade Waste customer base, improve efficiency, increase income. Increased share of income from Parks Events.	250	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
P	Planning and Economic Development		
P2c	Further increase in charges and changes to funding coupled with savings achievable from a corporate approach to and restructure of employment services.	305	Work continues to develop firm approach
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	20	Report to Scrutiny and M&C now scheduled for October 2016

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	Status
	and postage costs.		
Q	Safeguarding and Early Intervention		
Q1.5g	Feb 2015 saving – case management efficiencies between FIP & TFS	111	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
Q4a	Social care supplies and services reduced spend.	240	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
Q4b	Social care financial management through continued cost control on all areas of spend.	50	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)
Q4c	Placements: continuing strategy to use local authority foster placements where possible.	200	Work continues to develop firm approach. New savings proposals further progress this approach.
Q5	Youth Service: accelerate tapering of support to Youth Service to statutory minimum (will follow decision on creation of a mutual).	150	On track (monitoring via financial forecasts)

12. PUBLIC HEALTH

- 12.1. In September 2015, following scrutiny and the work of a task and finish group, Mayor & Cabinet approved £2m of savings on public health budgets, including sexual health, by 17/18 (ref - A16 and A17).
- 12.2. In the Spending Review and Autumn Statement 2015 the government announced further cuts to funding for public health services. For Lewisham this has resulted in a grant reduction of £2.7m by 2017/18. The Council therefore needs to save a total of £4.7m by 1 April 2017.
- 12.3. This approach and an outline of the savings was presented to members in July 2016. A report to Healthier Communities Scrutiny Committee on 13 September 2016 describes the activity to achieve the necessary level of savings. In summary they are:

Public Health draft officer savings proposals by NHS England cat.				
Service Area	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000	Gap £'000
Children 5-19 programme			0	
Health protection	35	23	58	
Sexual health	150	500	650	
Substance misuse	50	500	550	
NHS health check programme	76	75	151	
Obesity	47	149	196	
Physical activity	200		200	
Other public health services	128	452	578	

Prescribing	130		130	
National child measurement prog.		1,515	1,515	(272)
Public Health advice			0	
Public Health team	210			
Smoking and tobacco	70	125	195	
Total	1,096	3,610	4,434	(272)

13. TIMETABLE

13.1. The key dates for considering this savings report via scrutiny and Mayor and Cabinet (M&C) are as follows:

Review of Savings proposals	Children & Young People	Healthier	Housing	Public Accounts	Safer Stronger	Sustainable
Select Ctte.	14 Sep	13 Sep	7 Sep	22 Sep	15 Sep	14 Sep
M&C	28 Sep					

13.2. The M&C decisions are then subject to the usual Business Panel scrutiny call in process and reconsideration at the following M&C if necessary. This report will be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel on the 4th October 2016.

13.3. If required, two more savings rounds can be taken through the decision process, still with the possibility of achieving a full year effect of savings in 2017/18. The key dates for these rounds are as follows:

Review of Savings proposals	Children & Young People	Healthier	Housing	Public Accounts	Safer Stronger	Sustainable
Select Ctte.	10 Nov	24 Nov	16 Nov	30 Nov	28 Nov	29 Nov
M&C	7 Dec					
Select Ctte.	11 Jan	12 Jan	10 Jan	25 Jan + Budget	17 Jan	24 Jan
M&C	8 Feb + Budget					

13.4. The overview and Scrutiny Business Panel for these rounds will be 13 December and 14 February respectively.

13.5. In addition to the above, further proposals will need to be presented for decision during 2017/18, with the possibility of achieving a partial year effect for that year and full year effect for future years.

14. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 14.1. This report is concerned with the saving proposals 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 and appendices itself.

15. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS - DRAFT

Savings proposals - General Legal Implications

(further specific legal implications for individual proposals are set out in the appendices)

Statutory duties

- 15.1. 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

- 15.2. 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

- 15.3. 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

- 15.4. 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.
- 15.5. 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.
- 15.6. 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.
- 15.7. 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/>
- 15.8. 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

- 15.9. 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/>
- 15.10. The EHRC has also issued Guidance entitled “Making Fair Financial Decisions”. It appears at Appendix x and attention is drawn to its contents.
- 15.11. The equalities implications pertaining to the specific service reductions are particular to the specific reduction.
- 15.12. Members are reminded that the overall equalities in respect of these savings and the other scrutinised and presented to Mayor & Cabinet in September 2015 were considered through the individual proposals and overall. Appendix xii presents that information for ease of reference.

The Human Rights Act

- 15.13. 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.
- 15.14. 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

15.15. 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

15.16. 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

15.17. 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

15.18. 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

15.19. Members’ attention is drawn to the specific legal implications arising in relation to particular proposals set out in this report in Appendix viii.

16. CONCLUSION

16.1. The Council expects to need to make further savings between now and 2019/20. The amount and timing has been detailed above, however the definitive position is dependent on 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 continues.

17. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

Short Title of Report	Date	Contact
Medium Term Financial Strategy	July 2016	David Austin
Revenue Budget Savings	September 2015	David Austin

Budget 2016/17	February 2016	David Austin
----------------	---------------	--------------

Appendices

- i.** A - Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health proposals
- ii.** E - Asset rationalisation proposals
- iii.** I - Management & corporate overhead proposal
- iv.** L- Culture & community services proposals
- v.** M - Strategic housing proposals
- vi.** Q - Early intervention & safeguarding proposals
- vii.** Savings Summary table
- viii.** Specific Legal Comments
- ix.** Corporate Savings Principles
 - x.** Making Fair Financial Decisions guidance
 - xi.** Efficiency Plan for Four Year Settlement
 - xii.** Summary of Equalities Implications

For further information on this report, please contact:

David Austin, Head of Corporate Resources on 020 8314 9114

CONTENTS PAGE

Appendix i

A – Smarter and deeper integration of social care and health

- A18. Widening the scope of charging for social care services
- A19. Reduction in the staffing costs for Assessment and Care Management
- A20. Reduction in Day Care
- A21. Reduction in Mental Health spend

Appendix ii

E – Asset rationalisation

- E6. Property investment acquisition
- E7. Develop private rental schemes

Appendix iii

I – Management and corporate overheads

- I11. Review insurance risk assessments

Appendix iv

L – Culture and community services

- L8. Facilities management
- L9. Assemblies fund
- L10. Adult Learning Lewisham subsidy

Appendix v

M – Strategic housing

- M4. PLACE/Ladywell
- M5. Hostel Acquisition
- M6. Reorganise provision of Handy Person service
- M7. Reduce No Recourse to Public Funds costs

Appendix vi

Q – Safeguarding and early intervention services

- Q6. Developing alternative pathways for care
- Q7. Review of Lewisham CAMHS
- Q8. Development of Fostering Service

Q9. Reduction in Looked after Children based on edge of care developments

Q10. Enhance Family Finding

Q11. Redesign of Melliot Road Centre and contact arrangements

APPENDIX i

A – Smarter and deeper integration of social care and health

A18. Widening the scope of charging for social care services

A19. Reduction in the staffing costs for Assessment and Care Management

A20. Reduction in Day Care

A21. Reduction in Mental Health spend

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Widening the scope of charging for social care services
Reference:	A18
LFP work strand:	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health
Directorate:	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) £200k by removing subsidy and/or increasing charges	No	Yes	No
b) £300k by improving income collection performance	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Council charges for most of the adult social care services it provides, with actual charges raised based on the service user's financial circumstances. There are some services, however, which are currently provided free to the service user and some where the charge is lower than the full cost of the service. This proposal is to consult on bringing most of the remaining services into the scope of charging and to charge the full cost of the service rather than a subsidised rate. Service users with income and capital below national thresholds would continue to receive services free.</p> <p>In 2015/16 Lewisham Adult Social Care supported 3,013 Services Users to live independently in their own homes, and a further 1,742 carers. Approx 66% of the non-carer service uses are charged. The proposed changes would potentially increase charges for up to 300 of these individuals. Additionally, up to 200 self-funders would also be charged.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The specific proposals are :</p> <p>A – £200k remove subsidy and/or increase charges To remove the current subsidy for day care meals; To charge for arrangement fees for self-funders; To increase the charges for day care meals; To increase the charges for Linkline/Community Alarm Service. To introduce means-tested charges for carers services To amend the non-residential charging policy to reflect DH guidance rather than the existing policy of Income Support + 25%</p> <p>B – £300k improve income collection performance Improve procedures - We will undertake a review of our income collection to ensure that it is robust and equitable. In conjunction with this a review project will be set up to look at our current collection process and the people who are not currently paying the</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

invoices for their care.

Consultation paper?

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

An EAA was completed in February 2015 regarding increasing charging for a range of adult Social Care services. As the proposal is to further charge and remove subsidies for such services, the overall assessment is that the saving proposals will have an adverse impact across the following equality groups: age; gender and disability.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Saving could be overestimated. Values will only be clear once we have reassessed needs and financial assessments are carried out.

Carers may disengage, indirectly increasing costs of care to Council.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	0	(9,666)	(9,666)	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) £200k by removing subsidy and/or increasing charges	200	0	0	200
b) £300k by improving income collection performance	300	0	0	300
Total	500	0	0	500
% of Net Budget	5%	0%	0%	5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A.Strengthening community input B.Sharing services C.Digitisation D.Income generating E. Demand management
D	E	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people’s achievement and involvement
8	9	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		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	
Medium	Low	

8. 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?

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

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

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

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Healthier Community 13 th August 2016. Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C

12. Summary timetable	
	on 28 September
	12 weeks Consultation starting end of September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultation ongoing
December 2016	31 st December 2016 Consultation closes.
January 2017	Results of consultation reported to members for consultation
February 2017	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C
March 2017	Review of Services Users needs in line with outcomes of consultation
April 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in the staffing costs for Assessment and Care Management
Reference:	A19
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care
Directorate:	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) £500k 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:
<p>Adults Social Care Assessment and Care Managers service provided Social Care support to 7,439 adults living in Lewisham during 2015/16. The services provided are both short term, such as re-ablement, aids and adaptations and long term care, such as personal support, social isolation and residential/nursing placements. Staff who work in Assessment and Care Management provide assessment, review and safeguarding support to service users in line with the Care Act 2014.</p> <p>Savings proposals for 16/17 & 17/18 to reduce staffing costs within the assessment and care management teams of adult social care were agreed by the Council in February 2016. 2016/17 savings were achieved by the deletion of the 11.5 FTE vacant posts.</p> <p>The adult social care improvement board has been established, chaired by the Executive Director for Community Services. The aim of this board is to oversee the work of further refinement to the assessment and care management processes. The programme of work will be underpinned by the Council's programme to improve IT systems with solutions that will further streamline the process by improving access to information, advice and sign posting for service users and improving the IT facilities available to staff by introducing mobile working. The following further savings have been identified :</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">17/18 £200k 18/19 £300k</p> <p>These savings will come from across the assessment and care management teams. Between 12-15 FTE posts out of 134 FTE are to be deleted following staff consultation and staffing re-structure. It is not possible to list the exact posts at this time, as the remodelling and pathway work will need to be completed, before decisions can be made on deletion of specific posts.</p> <p>This work will need to be aligned and consistent with the development of the adult integration programme.</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

Saving proposal

Savings will be achieved through the digital and integration programmes.

- Further reduce workforce by managing demand more effectively at the point of contact
- ASC Mobile Working –501k – these savings are to be identified through Digital Programme 17/18 -18/19
- Live Well App – 70k
- Enhanced care and support remodelling will identify posts that will be deleted as a contribution to this saving.
- Proportionate assessments and solutions – all assessment tools and processes are being re-viewed to ensure a proportional approach is taken throughout the assessment and support planning journey. This will ensure that signposting to relevant external services is undertaken at the most appropriate point, thus reducing the need for commissioned services.
- Conflation of roles – developing further trusted assessors using multi agency staff to undertake assessments and care planning where appropriate

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The changes will improve access, reduce duplication and improve outcomes for service users.

There will still be access by telephone and face-to-face interviews for those people who are unable to access information on-line.

A reduction in staffing could mean redundancies, however a high percentage of posts are currently covered by agency staff

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that vulnerable people will not receive timely and proportionate responses. This will be mitigated by improved reporting systems that will allow better oversight of both the quality and progress of assessments.

Robust risk assessment processes will be used at the point of contact to mitigate the potential of any high risk cases being dealt with inappropriately.

Should the demand for social care assessments and complex case work continue to increase then the staffing configuration will need to be reviewed as this will impact on the Council's ability to fulfil its statutory duty in accordance with the Care Act 2014.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,229	(3,189)	1,040	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) £500k assessment and care management staffing	200	300	0	500
Total	200	300	0	500

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

5. Financial information				
% of Net Budget	20%	30%	0%	50%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
C	D	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. 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	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

8. 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?

9. 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			No

10. 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
	It is not possible to list the exact posts at this time, as the remodelling and pathway work will need to be completed, before decisions can be made on deletion of specific posts.				
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	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
The assessment of need for vulnerable adults is a statutory function that the Council has to provide. Failure to undertake this function in a timely and proportionate manner will expose the Council to the risk of a Judicial review.
TBC

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	4 week staff consultation
December 2016	Management response completed and final decisions on new structures agreed.

12. Summary timetable	
January 2017	If relevant, issue redundancy notices.
February 2017	
March 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in Day Care
Reference:	A20
LFP work strand:	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health
Directorate:	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) £300k No renewal of block contracted day services at Cinnamon Court and Cedar Court	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Housing 21 (Now Sanctuary 21) Extra Care contract ends in March 2017. Part of that contract includes 50 places a day for day care across two sites: Cinnamon Court and Cedar Court. These places are currently block contracted at a cost of approximately £500K per annum.
Saving proposal
It is proposed that the block contract for day care is not renewed. Despite an 'injection' of new clients from the closure of the Ladywell unit last summer, activity levels have continued to decline, therefore the rationale for a block contract is void. A review of the current activity levels for the previous quarter, assuming like-for-like replacement of numbers of days, suggest that a saving of £300K could be realised. The remaining £200k would need to be kept in the budget to support people who have social isolation needs in other social activities through Personal Budgets/Direct Payments.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Sanctuary 21 could continue to offer day opportunities to existing clients at their Extra Care buildings/facilities for people to buy using Personal Budgets/Direct Payments. Should Sanctuary 21 continue to do so, there would be no impact on current service users.
Sanctuary 21 will need to consider how they invoice people directly for the days delivered.
This will also enable Sanctuary 21 to offer their service to other people who want to pay privately who do not meet social care eligibility.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Risk 1: That Sanctuary 21 will not continue to offer day services.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Mitigation: Support Planners will work with people to identify alternative ways for their needs to be met.

Risk 2: Sanctuary 21 may seek to combine the service currently allocated across two buildings into one to make it more cost effective.

Mitigation: The Council to support this.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	3,083	(981)	2,102	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a)	300	0	0	300
Total	300	0	0	300
% of Net Budget	14%	0%	0%	14%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E	B	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
8	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 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	Medium	

8. Ward impact

8. 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?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	Medium	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	High	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Medium
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The service as currently delivered is exclusively for older adults, primarily older women, some of who will also have additional disabilities, particularly relating to mobility or dementia. It is hoped that Sanctuary 21 will continue to provide a service on a spot purchase basis.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications	
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
Formal consultation is not needed. Should the service continue on a spot purchase basis there is effectively no change to the experience of the public.	
TBC	

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Healthier Communities on 13 th August 2016. Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Formal notification to Sanctuary 21 of the Council’s intention to not re-contract for day care as a block contract. Begin formal consultation if required
January 2017	Re-assessment of service users’ needs and where appropriate set up individual budgets/Direct Payments.
February 2017	Re-assessment of service users’ needs

12. Summary timetable

March 2017	End of contract
------------	-----------------

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in Mental Health spend
Reference:	A21
LFP work strand:	Smarter and deeper integration of social care and health
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Dee Carlin
Service/Team area:	Mental 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) £300k Manage demand for accommodation based services	No	No	No
b) £200k Review the implementation of s117	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Council and CCG commission SLAM to meet the needs of adults with severe and enduring mental health problems. A number of these individuals have their needs met in residential, nursing and supported living placements. Many of the individuals supported are subject to Section 117 of the Mental Health Act which places a duty on Local Authorities and the NHS to fund aftercare for individuals who have been subject to certain sections of the Mental Health Act 1983. Individuals who are subject to section 117 are exempt from charging for services
Saving proposal
A: £300k Commissioners will work with SLAM to manage demand for accommodation based care. An integrated placements panel will be established which will ensure our approach to assessment and review, is in line with the requirements of the Care Act, and all resources are considered when meeting needs, including those of the service user. The panel will ensure there is a consistent focus in supporting people to return to live in the community and reducing the reliance on more expensive placement based care. Existing care pathways and associated costs will be reviewed, commissioners will work with providers to establish common prices for packages of care and placements reducing the variations on the costs of placements and developing a stronger focus on outcomes
B: £200k Commissioners will work with SLAM to review the implementation of Section 117 of the Mental Health Act, to ensure that all those who are currently subject to sec 117 are reviewed, and where appropriate discharged from section 117. This would mean that the individual may need to financially contribute to the cost of their care (subject to the outcome of a financial assessment). In some instances it will be

3. Description of service area and proposal

appropriate to transfer the responsibility for funding to other funding authorities

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The impact to service users will be minimal as their needs will continue to be met. The development of an outcomes based approach will mean that service users are supported to have more choice in how their needs are met.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Savings may be over-estimated. The exact level of savings will only be clear once reviews of individual needs have been completed and financial assessments are undertaken.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	9,023	(1,642)	7,381	
Health				
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) £300k Manage demand for accommodation based services	300			300
b) £200k Review the implementation of s117	200			200
Total	500			500
% of Net Budget	7%	%	%	7%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	Yes
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:	Health impact TBC			

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E	D	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
8	9	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement

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

8. 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?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Medium	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	Medium	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	High	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:			
TBC			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			?

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Section 117 legislation is part of the Mental Health Act 1983.
TBC

12. Summary timetable	
Month	Activity
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation) Agreed list with SLAM of all service users on Section 117 by 31 st July 2016
August / September 2016	Panel to be set including partners 1 st September 2016 Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C

12. Summary timetable	
	on 28 September.
	Review programme of all services users agreed with SLAM
October 2016	Reviewing of all service users
November 2016	Quarterly Monitoring in place.
December 2016	Review of all service users
January 2017	Review of all service users
February 2017	Review of all service users
March 2017	
April 2017	Implement savings

APPENDIX ii

E – Property investment acquisition

E6. Property investment acquisition

E7. Develop private rental schemes

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Property investment acquisition
Reference:	E6
LFP work strand:	Asset rationalisation
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Corporate Resources
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £150k from property investment / acquisition	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Through the Treasury Management Strategy, approved by Council alongside the budget, the treasury team is responsible for managing the Council's cashflow and related investments and borrowing.
Saving proposal
The proposal is to seek out further opportunities to support Lewisham Homes or other partners acquire properties and / or invest in property funds in a manner that supports them and brings a return in line with the Council's strategic housing, regeneration and treasury objectives in the medium term.
The Council would do this by using its Treasury Management capacity in the medium term to serve as a facility to support the shared priorities of partners where the business case is sound and the Council is confident the risks can be effectively managed. The intention would be to use Council balances to support projects which pay a risk premium for accessing these funds. Assuming the projects then deliver the risk premium it can then be taken as a saving.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The potential impact will be to use some of the Council's financial muscle to support and accelerate investment in the Borough's infrastructure and housing supply to help deliver the Council's objectives.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
As with any investment the risk on commercial terms is that the value of assets decrease or costs on projects overrun, reducing the returns achieved by the investor. Another risk is that in the medium term (say ten years) these investments need to be paid back to enable the monies to be re-invested in other services. At that stage the saving will need to be found again.
The mitigating actions would be to focus on property investments which are asset backed so there is some fixed security. Also, where possible, to invest in schemes

4. Impact and risks of proposal

that have wider less tangible returns which would otherwise translate into expensive intervention costs for the Council (such as providing more housing locally to avoid expensive bed and breakfast costs and advance the outcomes for those being supported).

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
			N/A	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) £150k from property investment / acquisition	150			150
Total	150	0	0	150
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Political priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
D	E	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10	6	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	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

8. Ward impact

8. 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?

9. 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:	Low
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

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

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

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 / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
November 2016	Propose amendments to the Treasury Strategy
February 2017	Update Treasury Strategy with budget set 22 February
April 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Development of Private Rental Schemes
Reference:	E7
LFP work strand:	Asset Management
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Janet Senior / Freddie Murray
Service/Team area:	Asset Strategy and Technical Support
Cabinet portfolio:	Growth and Regeneration
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Mayor and Cabinet

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £150k Conversion of an asset for development	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Whilst in the past a number of the Authority's assets have been disposed of to assist development opportunities, generally by generating a one off capital receipt, this programme will investigate ways that assets can be utilised to generate a sustainable long term revenue income. Although not part of this formal project assessment, it should also be noted that in bringing forward such planning and development investment projects, they should contribute to the delivery of the borough's regeneration strategy and further enhance capital and revenue growth.
Saving proposal
To identify possible existing assets that, with some reorganisation of their current use, could be converted to Private Rented Sector (PRS) units, generating a net income of circa £150k per annum. And if this could not be achieved in the timescales identify other meanwhile uses that may be considered to achieve this target in the short term while the longer term PRS can be developed.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Staff – a minimal impact although potentially some staff may need to be relocated. Some temporary resources (including consultancy) will be required for the delivery of this savings proposal
Service Users – no impact as any services will continue from where they are relocated
Partners – no impact
Other Council Services - no impact
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Amongst others associated with individual projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role of the Authority as 'property developer' may attract adverse commentary from operating within the PRS sector whereas historically it has been associated with social housing which can be mitigated through effective communications by the Council.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

- Whilst the PRS market shows attractive returns currently these may differ when any schemes delivered by the Authority come to market (need to develop a mixed-portfolio of property investment assets, that also assist in delivering the broadest corporate priorities).
- Scaleability – insufficient numbers of PRS units to make the projects worth while on a site by site basis which would need to be addressed possibly by packaging smaller sites together (mitigated by good design approach, flexibility and creative / efficient management approach).
- Insufficient return to the Council after management and lifecycle costs. A suitable management agreement model will need to be agreed in advance amongst all potential partners which identifies suitable threshold numbers of units and returns (could balance risks by focusing on guaranteed returns as opposed to maximum returns, passing on risk).
- Competing interests for land - The school places programme may interfere with the investment income delivery. (can mitigate this by having a clearly identified set of school places projects, focused on existing CYP sites. Some appropriate housing may also be possible on some of these as an added benefit).
- Many of the risks associated with such investment can be mitigated by ensuring that the authority contracts with the best / most effective partners where necessary – with natural alignment of interests.
- Timing - the delivery of these new incomes requires significant negotiation and the construction of new assets, and each project is likely to take a number of years before income is generated, any delay in securing support and funding to enable the start of the programme will delay the achievement of income. Furthermore as new entrants enter the market place returns may be driven down.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	15,998	(8,350)	7,648	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) £150k Conversion of 43-45 Bromley Rd	150			150
Total	150			150
% of Net Budget	2%	%	%	2%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
D		A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
6	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	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

8. 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?

9. 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:			
N/A			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

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

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers

12. Summary timetable	
	– e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February
March 2017	Savings implemented
	Between September 2016 and April 2017 we will continue to develop options for the site (including the relocation of OH in consultation with the service). At the point of approval by M&C we will look to implement the preferred long term solution and meanwhile use (if necessary).

APPENDIX iii

I – Management and corporate overheads

I 11. Review insurance risk assessments

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Insurance – level of self-insurance risk
Reference:	I11
LFP work strand:	Management & Corporate Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Insurance & Risk
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Committee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £225k reduction in level of insurance reserves (for 10 yrs)	No	No	No
b) £25k reorganisation	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Insurance and Risk service 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. It is also responsible for setting and promoting the Council's policy and procedures for strengthening good risk management practices in the Council's day to day management of operations.</p> <p>The Council's insurance arrangements, excluding operations, cost approximately £3,500k per year. The amount varies based on claims and premiums each year. The split is roughly £2,000k paid as premiums and recharged to services and £1,500k paid out to settle the self-insured part of claims or paid centrally into provisions to cover future claims on self-insured activities.</p> <p>The insurance team's operational costs within the budget are £240k.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>a) £225k reduction in level of insurance reserves (for 10 years) A reduction in the level of reserves held for self-insurance purposes by releasing current reserves of £225k per annum for ten years. This will reduce the Council's insurance reserves by £2.25m.</p> <p>b) £25k restructure. The service manager recently applied for and was granted flexible retirement to reduce their working days to three days a week. This saves the service £25k a year. No staff consultation is required.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
No specific impact
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

4. Impact and risks of proposal

- a) No immediate service impact however an increase in carried risk for the organisation. The risk is higher as it increases the likelihood of the Council holding insufficient reserves to cover the self-insured elements if incidents occur. Should the risk materialise there would be an immediate cash call on reserves and (if not sufficient) service revenue budgets.
- b) The risk from the restructure is loss of expertise of a senior member of the team. This has been considered and is largely mitigated by moving to three days so key activities will continue to be covered and Council continues to have access to their skills and experience.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	3,900	(2,400)	1,500	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Reduce level of insurance reserves	225			225
b) Restructure	25			25
Total	250			250
% of Net Budget	17%	%	%	17%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
		A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	

7. 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
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. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

8. 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?

9. 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:	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

10. 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	1	1.0	1		
PO1 – PO5	2	1.9	2		
PO6 – PO8	1	0.9	1		
SMG 1 – 3	1	1.0	1		
JNC					
Total	5	4.8	5	0	0
Gender	Female	Male			
	4	1			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
		5			
Disability	Yes	No			
		5			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
	5				

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

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
April 2017	Savings implemented

APPENDIX iv

L – Culture and community services

L8. Facilities management

L9. Assemblies fund

L10. Adult Learning Lewisham subsidy

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Facilities Management
Reference:	L8
LFP work strand:	Culture and Community Development
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Liz Dart
Service/Team area:	Culture and Community Development Division
Cabinet portfolio:	Joan Millbank
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £200k Review of facilities management arrangements	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Community Resources Team within Culture and Community Development Service has responsibility for the direct management of a number of community buildings. This includes five directly managed community centres (Evelyn Community Centre, Sedgehill Community Centre, Scotney Hall, Sydenham Centre and Moonshot) and two voluntary sector hubs (Leomore Centre and Mulberry Centre). They manage the caretaking, cleaning and room hires for these buildings. The Council also has responsibility for all the running costs including utilities, rates and repairs. These costs are shared between Community Services and Regeneration. In addition the Division has responsibility for the facilities management contract for Deptford Lounge and the community use of spaces within the library and school.
Saving proposal
The proposal is in two parts; firstly to review the current facilities management arrangements for the seven buildings that are still directly managed by the Community Resources Team and look for the most efficient way of running these buildings in the future. Options to be considered will include outsourcing to a third party with experience in community facilities management or a social housing provider.
The second part is to re-tender the facilities management contract for Deptford Lounge. The current contract expires in October 2017. So any savings from this will not be fully achieved until 2018/19.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
All of these building were identified for continued community use as part of the Voluntary Sector Accommodation Plan produced in 2015. The Council will therefore be seeking new arrangements that can ensure the continued and effective provision of community use of these facilities and the impact on users and partners should therefore be minimal.
The review will impact on a number of staff within the Community Resources Team who currently support the directly managed facilities. Depending on the detail of the proposal TUPE may apply and there is likely to be the need for a reorganisation within

4. Impact and risks of proposal
the Community Resources Team.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Risk: New providers are not familiar with needs of the voluntary and community sectors. Mitigation: This will be written into the specification and scoring criteria of any tender exercise.
Risk: Failure to achieve saving through new arrangements. Mitigation: There are some areas of expenditure such as business rates that can be reduced through outsourcing without any impact on the service.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	164	(184)	(20)	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) £200k Review of facilities management arrangements	70	130		200
Total	70	130		200
% of Net Budget	-350%	-650%	%	-1000%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
A	D	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
1	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 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	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

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

8. 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?

9. 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

10. 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	3	3	4		1
Sc 6 – SO2	2	2	2		
PO1 – PO5	3	3	3		
PO6 – PO8	1	1	1		
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total	9	9	10	0	1
Gender	Female	Male			
	5	4			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

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

11. Legal implications**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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Tender exercise commences
January 2017	Outcome of tender exercise to M&C Community Resources Team staff re-org consultation commences
March 2017	Deptford Lounge tender exercise commences
April 2017	Directly managed buildings saving strand implemented Community Resources Team staff re-org implemented.
June 2017	Outcome of Deptford Lounge tender to M&C
October 2017	Deptford Lounge saving implemented.

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Removal of the Assembly Fund
Reference:	L9
LFP work strand:	Culture and Community Development
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	James Lee
Service/Team area:	
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Joan Millbank
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £270k Removal of the Assembly Fund	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>In May 2007, the Mayor's Commission on Empowering Communities and Neighbourhoods recommended that the London Borough of Lewisham introduce local ward assemblies for each of the borough's 18 wards. The Commission's objective was that these localised bodies, defined by the active involvement of ward councillors, would enable the people living and working in each ward to have a stronger and more direct influence in shaping their local community, supporting an ongoing process for identifying and resolving local concerns and implementing local solutions. The Local Assemblies programme was established in March 2008.</p> <p>The Local Assemblies programme particularly helps to deliver the Lewisham Sustainable Community Strategy priority outcome 'empowered and responsible – where people can be actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities'. The programme is also helping to deliver the corporate priority 'community leadership and empowerment – developing opportunities for the active participation and engagement of people in the life of the community'.</p> <p>Each Assembly has an individual fully voluntary co-ordinating group which plans its work between Assembly meetings and is supported by the Council-employed Development Officer. The local co-ordinating group has the active involvement of elected members and a range of individuals who have volunteered to support their local Assembly. These individuals bring organisational and communication skills which are invaluable in facilitating the work of the Assembly programme.</p> <p>Each Assembly is allocated a fund of £15,000 to run local projects. £2,500 of this sum is known as the Councillor Discretionary Fund and this can be utilised directly by Ward Councillors to address other areas which may arise during the course of the year or are not identified by residents as key priorities but which still have an impact on the local area.</p>
Saving proposal
The removal of the assembly Fund of £15,000 per ward - £270,000 across the whole borough.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The proposal will lead to the loss of £15,000 per ward to allocate to local projects. The exact impact of this will depend on what the Assembly would have chosen to allocate the funds to.
The vast majority of these funds are allocated to local voluntary and community groups to deliver local services and this provision will be reduced as a result of this saving.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The small grants fund and festival fund will still be available to fund some activity on an annual basis but there will be an expectation that the role of the Assembly shifts from the allocation of these funds to the coordination of wider community activity and volunteer led projects that do not receive direct funding from the Council.
The staffing resource for the delivery of the Assembly Programme will be unaffected by this proposal.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	345	(0)	345	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Removal of the Assembly Fund	270	0	0	270
Total	270			270
% of Net Budget	78%	0%	0%	78%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
A	E	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Low	

7. 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
1.	9.	
Impact on main priority – Positive /	Impact on second priority – Positive /	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Neutral / Negative	Neutral / Negative	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	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	Impact will be uniform across all wards.
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Not known	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Not known
Gender:	Not known	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Not known
Age:	Not known	Sexual orientation:	Not known
Disability:	Not known	Gender reassignment:	Not known
Religion / Belief:	Not known	Overall:	Not known
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

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

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

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
July 2016	Paper to Labour Group
August / September 2016	Budget setting
October 2016	Liaison with Assemblies
November 2016	Liaison with Assemblies
December 2016	Liaison with Assemblies
January 2017	Liaison with Assemblies
February 2017	Liaison with Assemblies

12. Summary timetable

March 2017	Savings implemented
------------	---------------------

L9 – Local Assembly Fund

Equalities Analysis Assessment

Name of proposal – Removal of Local Assembly Fund


Lead officer - James Lee (Head of Cultural and Community Development Service)

Start date of Equality Analysis 10 August 2016

End date of Equality Analysis 12 August 2016

Background - This document is the Equalities Analysis Assessment to assess the impact of the removal of the Local Assembly Fund.

Local Assembly Fund - £12,500 available to all 18 Lewisham wards and disseminated via the Ward Assembly. On top of this Ward Councillors have £2,500 Councillor Discretionary Fund available which some choose to add to the Assembly Fund making £15,000 available. For the purpose of this assessment the two funds are combined as they are administered identically. The allocation process varies ward to ward with some assemblies funding projects using a commissioning process having already identified need and gaps in provision. Other wards use a small grants process with applications needing to meet at least one of the assembly priorities as decided by the assembly.



Areas funded by the Assembly Fund will change year to year as new organisations become involved and fresh projects are identified. However, assembly funding has consistently supported a large number of projects that benefit both younger and older people.

In 2015-16 46% of Local Assembly Fund projects were specifically targeting either young people or older people, this equates to approximately £124,000 of the £270,000 available.

Impact on small local projects – Whilst the sums involved are quite small, the Assembly Fund clearly provides an opportunity for local organisations to run projects that are based locally and benefit local people. We know that having to travel can be detrimental to buy-in and this is particularly evident with both young and old people. Therefore ward based activities can be very successful, in addition as they are funded on local need there tends to be high demand. Many of the activities funded are linked to health and wellbeing such as girls' football and day trips. At a time when we are recognising the need to combat obesity and social isolation many of these projects directly address this.

Data Summary for age - According to the 2011 Census some 70,100 Lewisham residents are aged between 0-19 (25% of the population), whilst some 179,800 residents are aged between 20-64 (65% of the population). By contrast there are some 26,200 older people aged 65 and over (9.5%).

According to the 2013 Sub National Population Projections by 2021 the number of Lewisham residents aged 0-19 is expected to rise to 79,570 (25% of the population), whilst the number of people aged 20-64 is expected to reach 208,190 (65% of the population). By contrast the number of people aged 65 and older is expected to increase to 30,570 (10% of the population).

Ward profiles suggest that a greater number of older residents (65+) live in the south of borough in areas like Downham or Grove Park; whilst younger residents (0-19) are spread throughout the borough more evenly.

Conclusion – It is important to emphasise that areas funded by the Assembly Fund change every year, however the Local Assemblies consistently support a large number of projects that benefit both old and young people. The Small and Faith Fund with a particular emphasis on Communities that Care can mitigate the impact as can the commissioning of some youth activities by the Children and Young People Service and Crowdfunding. However, there will still be a negative impact particularly on the smaller / more local services and new community organisations many of whom will use the Assembly Fund as their first 'dip' into applying for funding. The process required to apply for the Assembly Fund is relatively straightforward and this is clearly of benefit to some of the older peoples' groups who may not have the same level of both IT and funding expertise.

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

Ward	Project	Meets All	Age	Disability	Gender Reassignment	Marriage & Civil Partnership	Pregnancy & Maternity	Race	Sex	Sexual Orientation
Grove Park	Eco Communities		OP							
Catford South	Ageing Well in Lewisham		OP							
Catford South	Brownhill Road Baptist Church		OP							
Catford South	Corbett Residents Association	Yes								
Catford South	Corbett Residents Association	Yes								
Catford South	Culverley Road Residents Association	Yes								
Catford South	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP						F	
Catford South	Lewisham Youth Theatre		YP							
Catford South	Corbett Estate Neighbourhood Forum	Yes								
Forest Hill	SEE3 Portas Pilot	Yes								
Forest Hill	Forest Hill Fashion Week	Yes								
Forest Hill	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP						F	
Forest Hill	Friends of Albion Millennium Green	Yes								
Forest Hill	Forest Hill & Sydenham Free Film	Yes								

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

	Festival								
Forest Hill	20th Forest Hill (scoutlink) Scout Group		YP						
Lee Green	Glendale Managed Services	Yes							
Lee Green	Friends of Manor House Gardens	Yes							
Lee Green	Lee Fair Share		OP						
Lee Green	Lee Manor Community Garden	Yes							
Lee Green	Lee Green Lives	Yes							
Lee Green	Fuss@Hither Green	<u>Yes</u>							
Lee Green	Lee Green Lives		OP					F	
Lewisham Ctrl	Glendale Managed Services	Yes							
Lewisham Ctrl	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP					F	
Lewisham Ctrl	Glendale Managed Services	Yes							
Perry Vale	Forest Hill School		YP						
Perry Vale	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP					F	
Perry Vale	Walk In Space Youth Club		YP						
Perry Vale	Lewisham Elders Resource Centre (Seniors)		OP						
Perry Vale	Friends of Dacres Wood	Yes							
Perry Vale	Sign Language & Deaf Awareness			Yes					
Rushey Green	Catford Street Trees	Yes							

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

Rushey Green	Friends of Mountsfield Park	Yes							
Rushey Green	Lewisham Asian Elders and Carers Group		OP				Yes		
Rushey Green	Lewisham Irish Community Centre		YP				Yes		
Rushey Green	Lewisham Youth Theatre		YP						
Rushey Green	St Dunstan's Enterprises		YP					F	
Rushey Green	Broadway theatre	Yes							
Bellingham	Solon Security	Yes							
Bellingham	8th Lewisham Scout Group		YP						
Bellingham	Demand Energy Equality	Yes							
Bellingham	Sport Fun 4 All	Yes							
Bellingham	Sydenham Arts	Yes							
Bellingham	Christ Church United Reformed Church Churches Together in Bellingham	Yes							
Bellingham	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP					F	
Bellingham	Christ Church United Reformed Church Churches Together in Bellingham	Yes							
Bellingham	ABC Under 5		YP						
Bellingham	Lewisham Disability Coalition			Yes					

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

Brockley	Nestor Milyaev (Fix your Bike Brockley)	Yes							
Brockley	St John's Church Deptford		OP						
Brockley	Brockley Society Tree Committee	Yes							
Brockley	Chelwood House for Families		YP						
Brockley	Max Media Arts CIC	Yes							
Brockley	Frameless Arts CIC	Yes							
Brockley	Bright Beginning		YP						
Brockley	Brockley Society Tree Committee	Yes							
Brockley	Little Babbaz		YP						
Brockley	Heston Nature Garden Group	Yes							
Bellingham	Sydenham Community Library		YP						
Bellingham	Bellingham Community Project	Yes							
Bellingham	Bellingham Community Project for DFCG			Yes					
Whitefoot	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP					F	
Whitefoot	Downham Nutrition Partnership	Yes							
Whitefoot	Goldsmiths Community Association	Yes							
Whitefoot	Downham Celebrates Company	Yes							
Whitefoot	The Christmas Cracker Trip		OP						

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

	Venues Project									
Whitefo ot	Lewisham Citizens Advice Bureau	Yes								
Whitefo ot	The Christmas Cracker Trip Venues Project		OP							
Whitefo ot	Further Green Neighbourho od watch Committee	Yes								
Downha m	REAP Centre on behalf of ALIZA a place to be me		YP							
Downha m	Sports Fun 4 All	Yes								
Downha m	The Christmas Cracker Trip Venues Project		OP							
Downha m	Regal Education Arts Project		YP							
Downha m	Good Shepherd Youth Club		YP							
Downha m	Lewisham Citizens Advice Bureau	Yes								
Downha m	Academy Achievers		YP							
Downha m	Downham Celebrates Company	Yes								
Downha m	Downham Celebrates Company	Yes								
Sydenha m	Friends of Sydenham Community Library		YP							
Sydenha m	TNG Centre		YP							
Sydenha m	SEE3 Portas Pilot	Yes								

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

Sydenham	Sydenham Arts	Yes								
Sydenham	Lewisham Hear to Help / Action on Hearing Loss			Yes						
Sydenham	Friends of Sydenham Community Library	Yes								
Sydenham	Sydenham Community Library	Yes								
Sydenham	The Greener Homecroft Project Group	Yes								
New Cross	The New Cross Gate Trust	Yes								
New Cross	Carers Lewisham & Honeypot Charity		YP							
Grove Park	Skanska Christmas Tree	Yes								
Sydenham	Christmas Tree	Yes								
Crofton Park	Dalmain Pen		YP					F		
Crofton Park	Eco Communities	Yes								
Crofton Park	Ackroyd Community Association		OP							
Crofton Park	Ewart Road Housing Co-operative		YP							
Crofton Park	Friends of Blythe Hill Fields	Yes								
Crofton Park	Crofton Park & Honor Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Yes								
Crofton Park	St Saviours Church		OP							
Crofton Park	Walk In Space Youth Club		YP							
Crofton	Acorn		YP							

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

Park	Childrens Club									
Blackheath	Church of Ascension						Yes			
Blackheath	Winning Post Sports Services		OP					M		
Blackheath	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP					F		
Blackheath	Quaggy Development Trust		OP							
Blackheath	Quaggy Development Trust		OP							
Blackheath	Age Exchange		YP							
Blackheath	Age Exchange		OP							
Ladywell	Max Media Arts CIC	Yes								
Ladywell	Friends of Brockley & Ladywell Cemeteries	Yes								
Ladywell	Hopcroft Forum	Yes								
Ladywell	Ladywell Youth Club & One Community Project		YP							
Ladywell	St Andrews Centre	Yes								
Ladywell	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP					F		
Grove Park	Dalmain Athletic Girls Football Club		YP					F		
Grove Park	WG Grace Senior Citizen Tuesday Club		OP							
Grove Park	Baring Primary School	Yes								
Grove Park	Carers Lewisham		YP							
Grove Park	Glendale Managed	Yes								

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

	Services									
Grove Park	SCALE Projects		YP							
Grove Park	Volunteer Centre Lewisham	Yes								
Grove Park	Chinbrook Dog Show	Yes								
Grove Park	9th Lewisham Scout Group		YP							
Lewisham Ctrl	Skanska Christmas Tree	Yes								
Blackheath	Blackheath Society	Yes								
Crofton Park	Crofton Park & Honor Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Yes								
Downham	Frying Squad	Yes								
Forest Hill	Teatro Vivo	Yes								
New Cross	New Cross & Deptford Free Film Festival	Yes								
New Cross	New Cross Learning	Yes								
New Cross	Creekside Education Trust		YP							
New Cross	ALIZA - a place to be me		YP							
New Cross	SIGNAL Family Support		YP	Yes						
Whitefoot	St John The Baptist Church	Yes								
Whitefoot	Whitefoot & Downham Community Food Plus Project	Yes								
Telegraph Hill	Just Older Youth		OP						M	
Telegraph Hill	LBL Greenscene	Yes								
Telegra	New Cross	Yes								

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

ph Hill	Gate Trust									
Telegraph Hill	Hillview Community Services							Yes		
Telegraph Hill	Telegraph Hill Centre		OP							
Telegraph Hill	Sew 4 U Fashion		YP							
Telegraph Hill	Telegraph Hill Playclub		YP							
Telegraph Hill	Somerville Youth and Play Provision		YP							

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Adult Learning Lewisham
Reference:	L10
LFP work strand:	Culture and Community Development

1. Savings proposal	
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Liz Dart
Service/Team area:	Adult Learning Lewisham
Cabinet portfolio:	Chris Best
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £40k General revenue subsidy reduction	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Adult Learning Lewisham helps over 4,000 people each year to achieve their goals, improve their skills and transform their lives through adult learning classes. There are over 12,000 enrolments on 1,100 different courses with a 92% success rate. The service runs from three specialist adult learning centres in Brockley, Lewisham and Grove Park as well as working in a number of community settings.
Saving proposal
Adult Learning Lewisham is primarily funded by the Skills Funding Agency with an annual grant allocation of £3.2m in 2016/17. This is supplemented by fees income from learners. The Council provides subsidy in the form of corporate overheads including the running costs of three adult learning centres. In addition there is a nominal revenue budget subsidy of £40k per annum. It is proposed to reduce this to £0 through a combination of increased income from fees and expenditure efficiencies.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
It is anticipated that this saving can be achieved with minimal impact to the service.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
No risks identified as the saving is only a very small percentage of the service turnover.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	3,934	(3,892)	42	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) £40k General revenue subsidy reduction	40			40
Total	40			40
% of Net Budget	95.2%	%	%	%
Does proposal	General	DSG	HRA	Health

5. Financial information				
impact on: Yes / No	Fund			
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
D	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	

7. 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.	5.	
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	

8. 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?

9. 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

10. Human Resources impact

10. Human Resources impact

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

11. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

TBC

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
March 2017	Savings implemented

APPENDIX v

M – Strategic housing

M4. PLACE / Ladywell

M5. Hostel Acquisition

M6. Reorganise provision of Handy Person service

M7. Reduce No Recourse to Public Funds costs

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	PLACE / Ladywell
Reference:	M4
LFP work strand:	M – Strategic housing
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Genevieve Macklin
Service/Team area:	Strategic Housing
Cabinet portfolio:	Housing/Cllr Egan
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Housing/PAC

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £85k generating income from leasing PLACE / Ladywell development	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Strategic Housing Service manages and commissions housing services to meet the Council's housing objectives.
The PLACE / Ladywell project has been developed as a response to the on-going shortage of affordable temporary accommodation for homeless households, and makes temporary use of a vacant site in advance of long term regeneration.
Saving proposal
PLACE / Ladywell includes 24 residential units as well as a range of ground floor commercial uses.
Mayor & Cabinet agreed to lease the 24 homes to Lewisham Homes, so that they might be made available to homeless families awaiting a permanent housing offer.
Lewisham Homes will collect rent, and manage the properties, and will pay an annual lease rent to the Council. This lease rent is £205,000.
The £85,000 saving proposal is the surplus that the Council will make from this lease rent, after all financing costs associated with the construction of the building are paid.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The proposal in itself addresses risks to residents by providing a better and more affordable form of temporary housing.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The PLACE / Ladywell development is time limited, and expected to stay on the Ladywell site for four years. At this point the building will be moved, and another future use found for it. The income is therefore guaranteed for four years, after which it is dependent on the future use found for the building.
Officers have already commenced activity to find another site. The building is

4. Impact and risks of proposal

warranted for 60 years and for up to 10 moves. Both of these factors will protect the Council’s position.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	120	*(205)	(85)	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Generating income from leasing PLACE / Ladywell development	85			85
Total	85			85
% of Net Budget	100%	%	%	100%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

* This is an income generating scheme which is expected to achieve income in the region of £205k per year. Once corporate costs have been taken, a net income of £85k will be available to put forward for savings.

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
D	E	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
6	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	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

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

9. 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:			
This will have a positive impact for homeless households			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

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

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Savings implemented (this can be implemented in-year)

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Hostel Acquisition
Reference:	M5
LFP work strand:	M – Strategic housing
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Genevieve Macklin
Service/Team area:	Strategic Housing
Cabinet portfolio:	Housing/Cllr Egan
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Housing

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £150k generating income from renting newly acquired hostel accommodation	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The Strategic Housing Service manages and commissions housing services to meet the Council's housing objectives.
The Hostels Acquisition project was agreed in 2014 as a response to the on-going shortage of affordable temporary accommodation for homeless households. It enabled an agreed programme of investment to purchase properties across Lewisham which could be converted to be used as hostels.
Saving proposal
To date an additional 38 hostel rooms have been acquired at: Stansted Road, Catford, Deptford High Street and at Hamilton Lodge & 118 Canonbie Road in Forest Hill,
The £150,000 saving proposal is the surplus that the Council will make from the rents collected from these properties, after all financing costs associated with the acquisition and conversion of the buildings are paid.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
The proposal in itself addresses risks to residents, by providing a better and more affordable form of temporary housing.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
These properties have been purchased and the conversion programme will complete in September, at which point the income stream will be in place. As such the risk is minimal

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	

5. Financial information				
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	401	* (551)	(150)	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Generating income from renting newly acquired hostel accommodation	150			150
Total	150			150
% of Net Budget	100%	%	%	100%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

* This is an income generating scheme which is expected to achieve income in the region of £150k per year. Once the refurbishment has been completed and corporate costs have been taken, a net income of £150k will be available to put forward for savings.

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
D	E	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
6	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	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

8. 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?

9. 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:			
This will have a positive impact for homeless households			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

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

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Savings implemented (this can be implemented in-year)

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Handyperson service
Reference:	M6
LFP work strand:	M – Strategic housing
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Kevin Sheehan
Service/Team area:	Private Sector Housing Agency
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Damien Egan
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Housing/Safer Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £150k transfer the service to be community run	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The handyperson scheme provides small repairs and adaptations to the homes of older or disabled residents so they can remain in their homes living safely and independently. This service is free, residents just pay the cost of any materials required.</p> <p>For current unlimited access to this service clients need to be at least 60-years-old and/or disabled and includes a priority group for those under 60 who are disabled and need to go home from hospital after an operation. The service is for home owners, private renters or the Council and some restrictions may apply for housing association tenants.</p> <p>Handy persons carry out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small plumbing repairs • Moving furniture for easier access • Fitting grab rails, hand rails and curtain rails • Changing tap washers • Adjusting doors • Changing light bulbs <p>There are currently three handypersons who perform approx. 3,300 small jobs per annum (based on 15/16 outputs). This equates to approx. five jobs a day per person and is considered an inefficient use of resources.</p> <p>Whilst the intention of this team is to provide a very useful subsidised service it is considered to be inefficient as it is not directed to all those who may be eligible given the propensity of repeat jobs at no limit. Also, unlike other authorities, Lewisham does not charge service users for this service. The cost of this service is £150k (including vans, tools and staffing costs) if we were to charge.</p>
Saving proposal
There is a current review underway to establish whether this service area can be transferred to Lewisham Local so that we can retain the service, improve outputs and keep it running outside of the Council.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Transferring this service will ensure vulnerable/elderly/disabled clients continue to be supported.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
That we cannot maintain the level of service as currently there are three dedicated handypersons – further actions needed to establish what other providers can do and how the service users may be impacted.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	154	(4)	150	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) transfer the service to be community run	150			150
Total	150			150
% of Net Budget	100%	%	%	100%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E		A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
TBC		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	
TBC		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
TBC		

8. 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?

9. 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:	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:			
This service is targeted for people who are elderly, vulnerable and/or disabled			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

10. 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	3	3	4	0	1
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total	3	3	4	0	1
Gender	Female	Male			
		3			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
		3			
Disability	Yes	No			
		3			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
				3	

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

12. Summary timetable
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and

12. Summary timetable	
implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc.), implementation:	
Month	Activity
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February
March 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	No Recourse to Public Funds Costs
Reference:	M7
LFP work strand:	M – Strategic housing
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Genevieve Macklin
Service/Team area:	No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF)
Cabinet portfolio:	
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £64k re-provisioning	No	No	No
b) £36k Housing Benefit Project	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
NRPF provides accommodation and subsistence to those assessed as destitute and unable to meet their needs because of their immigration status. This precludes access to most social security benefits, social housing, for many the right to work. Support for families is provided under S17 Children Act and for vulnerable adults, Part 1 Care Act.
Saving proposal
It is proposed to re-provision the most expensive eleven households to achieve savings of £64,000 over the financial year. These households have already been identified, as has 70% of the move on property.
Tenancy at will agreements have been finalised that establish a liability for rent for NRPF applicants to become eligible for Housing Benefit (HB) once they have had their 'no recourse' restriction lifted. This means that HB can now be claimed while applicants remain in accommodation procured and paid for by Lewisham until they are resettled into their own accommodation in the private sector.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Applicants will be required to move properties and while accommodation has been identified in London, none of it is in borough and will necessitate changes to school, GP services etc. HB will need to fast track HB claims from NRPF applicants
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
Moves out of borough or where changes to school are needed often involve legal challenges from representatives to prevent such moves. The authority is required to devote considerable resources defending such challenges and time delays will reduce the potential saving.
Legal challenges are also likely where applicants are moved to smaller (albeit suitable) accommodation.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,442	0	4,442	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a)	64			64
b)	36			36
Total	100			100
% of Net Budget	2%	%	%	2%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
E	D	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Medium	

7. 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
7	6	
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	Medium	

8. 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?

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

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

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

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

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February
March 2017	Savings implemented

APPENDIX vi

Q – Safeguarding and early intervention services

Q6. Developing alternative pathways for care

Q7. Review of Lewisham CAMHS

Q8. Development of Fostering Service

Q9. Reduction in Looked after Children based on edge of care developments

Q10. Enhance family finding

Q11. Review of Meliot Road Centre and contact arrangements

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Developing alternative pathways for care and LAC contract monitoring
Reference:	Q6
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding & early intervention
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Stephen Kitchman
Service/Team area:	Cllr Maslin
Cabinet portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £170k Shared housing	Yes	No	No
b) £420k Supporting people in semi-independence provision with housing services	Yes	No	No
c) £50k Access to public housing at 18	Yes	No	No
d) £270k Claiming housing benefit	Yes	No	No
e) £190k Contract monitoring	Yes	No	No
f) £100k improved pathway planning for leaving care	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Leaving Care Service – provides statutory case management for children who have been in local authority care and support their transition to adulthood from the age of 16 to 21 and in some circumstances up to the age of 25. The service advises and assists a looked after young person with a view to promoting their welfare when they stop being looked after.
Saving proposal
<p>a) Shared housing – This saving is to ensure two of our current properties are fully occupied rather than placing these young adults in more expensive semi-independence provision – Saving £170k</p> <p>b) Increasing the capacity of the Supporting People Pathway, so that Care Leavers can be supported in this provision, as an alternative to higher cost semi-independence provision. This saving is built around using this less expensive accommodation – Saving £420k</p> <p>c) Access to public housing at 18 – When a Care Leavers turns 18 the service currently start to looking for alternative independent housing for the young person. This can take a number of months, during this period the young person remains in</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

care and continues to be accommodated in higher cost accommodation. This saving proposal looks at starting the search for housing prior to the young person turns 18, allowing them to leave care on their 18th Birthday or just after – **Saving £50k**

- d) Claiming house benefit – This proposal involves the appointment of an officer to claim housing benefit on behalf of the young person – **Saving £270k**
- e) Contract monitoring – This proposal will look at tracking all residential and semi-independence provision to ensure that the agreed contract is being delivered or the costs of the contract is brought in line with the service and needs of the young person – **Saving £190k**
- f) Appointment of two Personal Advisors to support children this will allow an improved pathway planning & support for independence skills provision for leaving care and in turn reduce the costs of placements – **Saving £100k**

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- a) Shared housing – No negative impact on young people or the service. Young people will be placed in this accommodation where it is deemed that this is appropriate for them.
- b) A greater number of young people will be passing through the Supporting People Pathway, but funding from Children’s Social Care will be used to expand the provision available and so this will not result in fewer units being available for non-Care Leavers.
- c) Children’s Social Care and Housing need to bring the work being done with the young person to find their own housing, prior to them turning 18, rather than after them turning 18. This shouldn’t result in more work for the services, just work taking place at a different point in time.
- d) There will be no negative impact from this. It is money that should be already being claimed, but is not consistently, due to a lack of coordination and current capacity for this process.
- e) This should have a positive impact on the quality of provision and thus the quality of care and better achievement of outcomes for Looked After Children and Care Leavers. This will however result in additional work for the Service.
- f) This has a positive impact on the Leaving care Service and capacity to work with young people to move to independence at the earliest possible appropriate stage, simultaneously assisting with reduction of budget pressures.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

- a) and b) No risks identified.
- c) Risk is developing a new process and legal and procedural barriers will need to be reviewed and navigated. Will be mitigated by this piece of work being progressed as a joint priority between Children’s Social Care and Housing. Senior Management overview is in place.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

d), e) and f) Additional capacity is needed to enable this to happen. Risk that this will not be available, is being mitigated by funding having been agreed and process underway to recruit a new Contract Officer post that will complete these 2 pieces of work. Approval has also been given for recruitment of the Personal Advisors. It is intended that improved provider management will ensure Housing Benefit is claimed, some additional business support may be required to kick start this.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	7,308	(0)	7,308	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Shared housing	170	0	0	170
b) Supporting people in semi-independence provision with housing services	420			420
c) Access to public housing at 18	50			50
d) Claiming house benefit	270			270
e) Contract monitoring	190			190
f) - Improved pathway planning & support for independence skills provision for leaving care	0	100		100
Total	1,100	100	0	1,200
% of Net Budget	15%	1%	0%	16%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E	A	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
7	2	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement

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

8. 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?

9. 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

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000:</p> <p>This act amends the Children Act 1989 by replacing provisions in section 24 on after care of children looked after by local Authorities. It also creates new duties in relation to planning for Children whose status as looked after children will be ending. Pathway plans, personal advisers, eligible children and relevant children: these comprise the new language of provisions for Children leaving the care system. Provisions come into force, with Related regulations, on 1 October this year.</p> <p>An 'eligible child' is one aged 16 or 17, who has been looked after by a local authority for a period (prescribed under the regulations as 13 weeks), or periods amounting in all to that period, which began after he/she reached 14 years of age and ended after he/she reached the age of 16. It is the duty of the local authority looking after an eligible child to advise, assist and befriend him/her with a view to promoting his/her welfare when they have ceased to look after him/her.</p>

11. Legal implications

For each eligible child, the local authority shall carry out an assessment of his/her needs with a view to determining what advice, assistance and support it would be appropriate for them to provide while they are still looking after him, and after they cease to look after him/her, and shall then prepare a pathway plan for him/her.

The plan has to be kept under regular review. A local authority shall arrange for the child to have a personal adviser

TBC

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February
March 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings Proposal	
Proposal Title:	Review of Lewisham CAMHS
Reference:	Q7
LFP Work Strand:	Safeguarding & Early Intervention
Directorate:	Children & Young People
Head of Service:	Warwick Tomsett
Service/Team Area:	Joint Commissioning
Cabinet Portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People / Healthier

2. Decision Route			
Saving Proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £194k Improve the access pathway for child and adolescent mental health services	Yes	No	No
b) £50k Further integration of mental health services for looked after children	Yes	No	No

3. Description Of Service Area And Proposals
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>Service configuration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) in Lewisham are divided into specialist community and tertiary inpatient/outpatient services ▪ There are eight teams within the specialist community service, which cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Generic support for significant mental health issues/access into CAMHS ○ Children and young people involved with the Youth Offending Service ○ Children and young people who are looked after (LAC) ○ Children and young people with disabilities ○ Children and young people with severe and enduring mental health issues ▪ These savings proposals focus on the four teams providing generic support to young people (East and West Clinic teams) and specific support to looked after children (SYMBOL and the Virtual School for CAMHS) <p>Commissioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lewisham CAMHS (excluding inpatient and some outpatient services) is commissioned by the Joint Commissioning team on behalf of both NHS Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and the London Borough of Lewisham. Services are delivered by South London & Maudsley (SLAM) NHS Foundation Trust <p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The total funding for CAMHS is £4.286m, broken down as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local authority contribution – £1.008m ○ CCG contribution – £2.775m ○ Other funding (e.g. DoH, DSG, Pupil Premium Grant) – £503k

3. Description Of Service Area And Proposals

Provision

- CAMHS services are limited and can only be accessed by young people who exceed certain thresholds for risk and need. However, CAMHS provision is one element of a broader range of support available to meet the emotional and mental health needs of children and young people – other provision includes schools-based counselling and mental health & wellbeing services delivered by local voluntary and community organisations

Context

Strategic approach

- *Lewisham's Mental Health & Emotional Wellbeing Strategy* – this strategy sets out our vision and priorities for young people's mental health provision across the borough:
 - Create better, clearer and more responsive care pathways to enable improved access into appropriate services
 - Invest in evidence-based training and practice to ensure earlier identification and improved support
 - Embed resilient practice in community settings, where we will create a young person population that is better able to cope when faced with adversity
 - Increase awareness of mental health and emotional wellbeing and provide guidance regarding where to go for support

Issues

- *Funding* – Lewisham needs to identify £45m of savings to be delivered by 2019/20, in addition to savings of over £120m already achieved since 2010. Over this period, no savings have been taken from the c.£1m local authority contribution to CAMHS
- *Rising complexity of cases* – clinicians (particularly those within the two generic teams) have reported that presenting need is increasing in terms of severity, meaning that capacity is stretched across the current service
- *Performance* – levels of rejected referrals (39% overall), waiting times (approximately 13-14 weeks), intervention length and intensity (average length of intervention is 9 appointments over fifty-four weeks) and DNA rates (12% across the service)¹
- *Pathways* – pathways are not always consistent across community provision and CAMHS clinical services, plus thresholds between the two are not well understood (a high number of rejected referrals are inappropriate and, in many cases, children and families are being signposted to universal services who are not equipped to deal with this level of need)

Opportunities

- *CAMHS transformation* – annual CCG funding over four years (until 2019/20) to transform the way in which child and adolescent mental health services are delivered locally. There is a particular focus on crisis care, eating disorders and reshaping services in line with the national 'Future in Mind' recommendations

Saving proposals

These savings proposals should be regarded as an opportunity for positive change, enabling us to reshape part of the current CAMHS service (supported by CAMHS transformation funding) in order to deliver a more integrated and streamlined clinical

¹ Based on Lewisham CAMHS Q4 data (2015/16)

3. Description Of Service Area And Proposals

function which embeds outreach and consultation within community-based settings and services, meeting the needs of children and young people more effectively.

Proposal 1 – Improve the access pathway for child and adolescent mental health services

- *Focus of proposal*
 - Phase 1 – we will enable greater alignment of the two generic teams which provide a route into CAMHS by merging operational management. Alongside this, we will integrate the crisis care team within the generic function, providing additional resources to assess all emergency presentations via A&E, all urgent presentations via schools, police, children’s social care & GPs and undertake seven day follow-ups
 - Phase 2 – we will implement the Choice & Partnership Approach (CAPA) across the service. The CAPA model was developed specifically for CAMHS services and, based on its implementation in other areas (including Greenwich), we anticipate that it will significantly improve the flow of cases, reduce the overall treatment time and increase the speed from referral to treatment. This will be supported by technical and process redesign across the generic function, plus a reduction in non-core functions

- *Wider redesign activity (supported by CAMHS transformation funding) – we intend to further enhance the access pathway for children and young people through the development of a blended online/face-to-face triage and clinical support model (see report for further detail) and by establishing CAMHS outreach support in the community, which will combine consultation training and short term interventions*

- *Delivery of savings*
 - Phase 1 – we anticipate that savings of £44k could be achieved in 2017/18 through the merger of operational management. However, given the existing demand and capacity issues within the two generic teams, making further savings in this phase would present a potential clinical risk
 - Phase 2 – the implementation of the CAPA model will take place during 2017/18 (using CAMHS transformation funding to support programme and change management). The expected reduction in demand as a result of improvements to the access pathway as well as increased capacity following the CAPA implementation (plus wider redesign activity) and integration of the crisis care team should enable us to achieve savings of £150k during 2018/19 and 2019/20.

The local authority contribution to the generic CAMHS teams is £224k, so delivering savings of c.£194k would effectively mean that Lewisham no longer funded this part of the service. We are not proposing any savings to the CCG contribution at this stage as there would be a significant impact on the sustainability of the service, (as well as increased pressure on adult mental health services) if these savings were delivered over the same period. Given that the CCG contribution in this area has increased as a result of CAMHS transformation funding and the new access pathway should improve capacity and demand management, we will consider whether any further savings are viable after 2019/20.

Proposal 2 – Further integration of mental health services for looked after

3. Description Of Service Area And Proposals

children

- *Focus of proposal* – the Lewisham Virtual School has collaborated with CAMHS to pilot an integrated mental health outreach service (funded via the Pupil Premium Grant) which supports Lewisham looked after children and improves their readiness to learn. Given the success of this new approach, we intend to integrate the outreach service with the CAMHS SYMBOL service (which provides more traditional, clinic-based support for looked after children), blending outreach and clinic-based support within a graduated model. This will increase the speed of response for the most vulnerable children and young people whilst ensuring that we maximise opportunities to see them in the most appropriate environment
- *Delivery of savings* – we will work closely with CAMHS and the Lewisham Virtual School to develop and implement a new model at a lower cost by April 2017 (releasing savings of £50k, equivalent to one clinical post). To support the implementation of the new delivery model (particularly the outreach element), we will fund a CAMHS Practitioner post via the Pupil Premium Grant

4. Impact And Risks Of Proposals

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

Proposal 1 – Improve the access pathway for child and adolescent mental health services

- The proposed model offers a more coherent and consistent pathway for children and young people accessing mental health services, ensuring that there is better integration between community provision and CAMHS clinical services
- Although there will be a reduction in clinical staff within the generic function, the CAPA approach will enable the service to manage demand & capacity more effectively and respond flexibly to clinical pressures

Proposal 2 – Further integration of mental health services for looked after children

- The outreach approach will enable better promotion of resilience, prevention and early intervention whilst the blended model will deliver a more tailored intervention based on individual need

Outline risks associated with proposals and mitigating actions:

Proposal 1 – Improve the access pathway for child and adolescent mental health services

- *The complexity of cases within the generic function continues to rapidly increase over the next few years* – although it is difficult to accurately predict demand, the proposed redesign of the access pathway (including the development of a blended online/face-to-face triage model) and the implementation of CAPA should ensure that the service is better equipped to manage such pressures in the longer-term. These new approaches will be regularly reviewed in order to inform future practice
- *Implementation of the CAPA model takes longer than anticipated* – evidence from other areas suggests that an implementation timeframe of a year (to

4. Impact And Risks Of Proposals

develop and deliver the new way of working) is realistic, but this will require effective programme and change management as well as buy-in from the service (who are keen to implement the CAPA model). Additional resources will also be allocated to CAMHS in order to eliminate waiting lists prior to the CAPA implementation (to enable a quicker transition process)

- *Implementation of the CAPA model does not release sufficient capacity to deliver the proposed savings* – further modelling will be undertaken with the service to ensure that the figures identified are robust, but the core focus of the implementation will need to be achieving cashable savings (alongside process efficiencies)
- *CAMHS transformation funding ends in 2020/21* – funding is not confirmed beyond this point, so clear transition and contingency measures will need to be in place

Proposal 2 – Further integration of mental health services for looked after children

- *The needs of high risk children and young people are not met* – the proposed model will continue to provide clinic-based support where required, based on an assessment of individual need
- *The proposed model will be less efficient as fewer children and young people can be seen via an outreach approach* – the outreach approach is not intended to simply replicate clinic-based appointments in a local setting, but to provide more tailored support through a number of different routes, including more collaborative working with other services (such as schools & community organisations) and alternative ways of engaging children and young people (e.g. online provision)
- *Funding from the Pupil Premium Grant is not available beyond 2017/18* – we will need to develop a clear business case for future funding (including how it supports the new service model and delivery of improved outcomes for vulnerable young people)

5. Financial Information

Controllable Budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
General Fund (GF)	£1,008k	£0k	£1,008k	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
Improve the access pathway for child and adolescent mental health services	44k	50k	100k	194k
Further integration of mental health services for looked after children	50k	0k	0k	50k
Total	94k	50k	100k	244k
% of Net Budget	9%	5%	10%	24% (7% of overall CAMHS funding)
Does proposal	General	DSG	HRA	Health

5. Financial Information				
impact on: Yes / No	Fund			
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment To Lewisham 2020 Priorities		
Main Priority	Second Priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E (Demand management)	A (Strengthening community input)	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	High	

7. Impact On Corporate Priorities		
Main Priority	Second Priority	Corporate priorities
7 (Protection of children)	2 (Young people’s achievement and involvement)	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	High/Medium	

8. 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?

9. 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:	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:

The CAMHS service supports children and young people with mental health needs, so it is likely that there will be a greater impact on specific protected characteristics like age and disability.

9. Service Equalities Impact	
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No	Yes

10. Human Resources Impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No (NHS staff)

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

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February
March 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Development of fostering service

1. Savings proposal	
Reference:	Q8
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding & early intervention
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Stephen Kitchman
Service/Team area:	Cllr Maslin
Cabinet portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £220 Fostering service increase of in-house carers	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The council's Fostering Service helps to find and provide support to foster parents allowing them to provide a Looked after Child with a stable and caring home. The foster carers provide a safe place and the support that these children and young people need to thrive, whatever situation they have come from. Wherever practicable, the Fostering Service will seek a stable placement, avoiding multiple placement moves for children and young people. Foster carers can either be in house from a pool of Lewisham carers or come from an independent agency. Where a suitable foster placement cannot be found or where such placements repeatedly fail, the only alternative is to place looked after children in residential provision. This is necessary for a very small cohort of children but should only be for those whose needs are so complex that they would not be able to be looked after in foster care, not because of non-availability or limited choice in foster placements.</p> <p>Recruitment of foster carers is currently undertaken by the contractor NRS who also recruit for Haringey, Croydon and Sutton.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>There are three stages to this savings proposals</p> <p>Firstly to work with the current external provider NRS foster care recruitment to increase the volumes of in-house foster carers. This includes better contract management and closer working with NRS to ensure that suitable carers are provided.</p> <p>Secondly to develop a comprehensive fostering strategy which will include review of current services and development of an in-house foster scheme; this will require some invest to save capacity, which is yet to be scoped but will be subject to a rigorous business case.</p> <p>Thirdly, to work to build a specialist foster care scheme which develops existing foster carers to take 'higher end' more challenging placements. While this has been the intention for some time, we have recently had an external review of our services which indicated that we should secure the foundations of our mainstream fostering service before progressing this aspect.</p> <p>A specialist scheme will help placement stability for our most vulnerable children and</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

provide a greater number of foster carers with the skills to prevent the escalation of behaviours that often currently necessitate a move (causing and further disruption to the child) or even in some cases a residential placement.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Looked after Children would continue to receive the most appropriate placements but more cost effectively and closer to their original home.

The mix of placements would move closer to that for our benchmark group since currently we are relatively high in our use of (expensive) independent fostering agency placements and residential placements.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

If the changes are not successful, costs will escalate further. This work is therefore part of the transformation programme for social care and will be managed as a project with clear deadlines and deliverables.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	23,080	(0)	23,080	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Fostering service increase of in-house carers	220	0	0	220
Total	220	0	0	220
% of Net Budget	1%	%	%	1%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E	A	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
7	2	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible

7. 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
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Low	

8. 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?

9. 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:			
These service changes will provide a positive outcome for children, but proportionally there are more children in care from ethnic minorities and with disabilities. When the new in house fostering service is set up, and EIA will be necessary.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>Children can come into care in two main ways, either that parents who have asked for help or because the child is at risk of significant harm.</p> <p>Under section 20 of the Children Act 1989 (voluntary agreement): where parents have asked for help and it has been assessed that their child can no longer stay at home, suitable accommodation for the child is found. Parental responsibility remains with the parent/guardian.</p> <p>Under section 31 of the Children Act 1989: if it is considered that the child is at risk of significant harm, the local authority may seek to start care proceedings. Through these court proceedings a care order can be granted to the local authority. When a care order is made, the local authority acquires parental responsibility and becomes a legal parent alongside the parent/ guardian.</p> <p>TBC</p>

11. Legal implications**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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February
March 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduction in numbers of Looked after Children resulting from improved edge of care services
Reference:	Q9
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding & early intervention
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Stephen Kitchman
Service/Team area:	Cllr Maslin
Cabinet portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £495k Reduction in Looked after Children based on edge of care developments	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The largest area of spend in Children’s Social Care is placements for looked after children. Lewisham has a relatively high number of looked after children, particularly adolescents and it would be possible, through improved support at the ‘edge of care’ to reduce the numbers who reach the point of having to be ‘looked after’. The key support at the edge of care is given by our Family Intervention Project and outreach services. These provide targeted outreach support for families in Lewisham, which focuses on enabling parents, carers and families to develop the skills necessary to meet the needs of their children to prevent the children becoming looked after. The services are both delivered in family homes and other community settings. The ultimate aim is to move families to a point where they require only universal support over a sustained period.
Saving proposal
The saving centres around ensuring that the re-commissioning of the Family Intervention Project provides a service better targeted at the most vulnerable groups and involves piloting and developing a support service with referral and assessment for young people on the edge of care. This reconfiguration of services will have the objective of reducing the number of children coming into care.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
It is in the interests of children and their families for there to be reduced escalation of need, allowing children to stay within their family environment were possible.
The aim will be for the number (per 10,000 children) of looked after children to move closer to the benchmark (our statistical neighbours).
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
If we fail to support young people within their families then those young people will end up as looked after anyway, resulting in budget overspends.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	23,080	(0)	23,080	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Reduction in Looked after Children based on edge of care developments	495	0	0	495
Total	495	0	0	495
% of Net Budget	2%	0%	0%	2%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
E	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Low	

7. 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
7	2	
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	
Medium	Low	

8. 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?

9. Service equalities impact	
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A	

9. Service equalities impact			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	Yes	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:			
This change should have a positive effect for children and their families, since it results in earlier support and intervention.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Children can come into care in two main ways, either that parents who have asked for help or because the child is at risk of significant harm.
Under section 20 of the Children Act 1989 (voluntary agreement): where parents have asked for help and it has been assessed that their child can no longer stay at home, suitable accommodation for the child is found. Parental responsibility remains with the parent/guardian.
Under section 31 of the Children Act 1989: if it is considered that the child is at risk of significant harm, the local authority may seek to start care proceedings. Through these court proceedings a judge a care order can be granted to the local authority. When a care order is made, the local authority acquires parental responsibility and becomes a legal parent alongside the parent/ guardian.
TBC

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February
March 2017	Savings implemented

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Enhanced Family Finding
Reference:	Q10
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding & early intervention
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Stephen Kitchman
Service/Team area:	Cllr Maslin
Cabinet portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £150k Enhanced family finding	Yes	Yes	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>This service provides stability to Looked After Children by identifying the right placement for a child early in their care journey whilst ensuring that individual and family needs are properly assessed and support services provided in order to achieve permanence of the placement. Lewisham provides a range of placement options to ensure that the right placement is available for every child. For many children returning home to their family after a period in care will be the route to permanence and stability. For others, returning to other family or friends under a formal or informal arrangement will be the setting they need in order to thrive. Remaining in care with a long term foster family or finding a new permanent family through adoption, special guardianship or residence orders are other routes to permanence.</p> <p>This proposal seeks to ensure family finding for children/young people with bespoke needs who otherwise would remain in higher cost placements, the proposal is in line with achieving good outcomes for children yet at the same time providing value for money within in house or commissioned services.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>This saving proposal is to improve the capacity of the family finding service to ensure that not only the right placement is found but the placement offers the best value possible. Wherever possible this will be with in-house foster carers and will rely less on the independent sector in order to generate the saving.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
<p>Looked After Children would continue to receive the most appropriate placements but more cost effectively</p> <p>Mix of placements would move closer to that for our benchmark group and support achievement of cost effective placements</p>
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
<p>Increased possibility of placement breakdown for more challenging children if the finding of specialist foster carers are not successful</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
If procurement changes are not achieved the budget for placements is less likely to balance in 2017/8

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	23,080	(0)	23,080	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Enhanced Family Finding	150	0	0	150
Total	150	0	0	150
% of Net Budget	1%	0%	0%	1%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E	A	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Low	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
7	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, 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	

8. 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?

9. 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:			
These service changes will provide a positive outcome for children, but proportionally there are more children in care from ethnic minorities and with disabilities.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

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

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
Children can come into care in two main ways, either because their parents have asked for help or because the child is at risk of significant harm.
Under section 20 of the Children Act 1989 (voluntary agreement): where parents have asked for help and it has been assessed that their child can no longer stay at home, suitable accommodation for the child is found. Parental responsibility remains with the parent/guardian.
Under section 31 of the Children Act 1989: if it is considered that the child is at risk of significant harm, the local authority may seek to start care proceedings. Through these court proceedings a judge a care order can be granted to the local authority. When a care order is made, the local authority acquires parental responsibility and becomes a legal parent alongside the parent/ guardian.
TBC

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	Consultations ongoing
November 2016	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February

12. Summary timetable

March 2017	Savings implemented
------------	---------------------

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Review of Meliot Centre Service and contact arrangements
Reference:	Q11
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding & early intervention
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Stephen Kitchman
Service/Team area:	Cllr Maslin
Cabinet portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) £500k Review of Meliot Centre service	Yes	No	Yes
b) £234k Development of contact centre for looked after children	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The Meliot centre is located in North Downham and is a borough wide service. It provides an assessment resource for Childrens Social Care, to assist in decisions relating to parenting capacity to help decide if a child can be looked after by their parent/carer. It is an in house facility. It is not a Family Centre open to the public, rather families come into the service by way of a referral.</p> <p>The main aim of the service is to contribute assessments to enable decisions to be made for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Safeguarding Children ➤ Avoiding the need for children to be looked after ➤ Supporting children being rehabilitated back to their families and local communities. <p>The service provides a social work service to children, young people and their families/carers and contributes to assessment, intervention, case planning and reviews.</p> <p>Looked after children have supervised contact with significant adults, including parents, carers, siblings and extended family members and others in their lives. Supervised contact is mostly ordered by the court when care proceedings have been initiated by the local authority following concerns regarding parental care to a child.</p> <p>“Contact” refers to all contact between a looked after child and significant others, including parents, others with parental responsibility, brothers, sisters, other relatives and friends. Direct contact means any face-to-face contact, from a short meeting to an overnight or longer stay. Indirect contact means letters, cards, telephone calls, texts, emails, exchange of photographs, videos and presents.</p> <p>Contact can be supervised / unsupervised depending on the assessed level of risk. When deemed necessary to safeguard the child direct contact must be supervised,</p>

3. Description of service area and proposal

details of how the supervision will be achieved will form part of the Care Plan.

Contact can help inform decision making about:

- The potential for re-unification with a parent/carer;
- The potential for kinship care within a child’s extended family;
- Contact following permanent placement other than the parents.

The interests of the majority of looked after children are best served by sustaining or creating links with their birth families including wider family members.

Currently supervised contact is spot purchased from private providers leading to a significant cost pressure on spend.

Saving proposal

The proposal is to review the work of the Meliot Centre to cease operation as primarily a family assessment centre and instead to re-focus it on operating as a contact centre, with a lesser function of providing parenting assessments. This would mean ending arrangements to pay a private provider for contact services and would therefore generate savings. In terms of contact, the aim would be to provide a service as good or better than that provided currently. In terms of assessment, this will have some impact on staff currently employed at the Meliot Centre but this will be managed through the Council’s ‘managing change’ procedures, ensuring that maximum advantage is taken of redeployment opportunities. For allocated social workers, managers will work closely with staff to minimise additional workload

A full report will be brought to Mayor and Cabinet later in the Autumn.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Contact will be provided in a consistent premises and within a Council service that allows flexibility of response to need as well as enabling stronger quality assurance than the current spot purchase arrangement.

Parenting assessment capacity will be retained for specialist assessment but more generic assessment will be embedded within the work of the allocated social worker

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There are risks that this change will result in an increase in independent social work assessments being ordered by the Court. However specialist assessments capacity is being retained and the model proposed is employed in most local authorities already.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	1,150	(0)	1,150	
Saving proposed:	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Total £'000
a) Review of Meliot Centre service	500	0	0	500

APPENDICES i –vi 2017/18 SAVINGS PROPOSAL PROFORMAS

5. Financial information				
b) Development of contact centre for looked after children	234	0	0	234
Total	734	0	0	734
% of Net Budget	64%	0%	0%	64%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating E. Demand management
E	A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Low	

7. 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
7	2	
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	

8. 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?

9. 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			

9. Service equalities impact	
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

10. 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	0.57			
Sc 6 – SO2	4	4		1	
PO1 – PO5	3	3		1	
PO6 – PO8	1	1			
SMG 1 – 3	0	0			
JNC	0	0			
Total	9	8.57			
Gender	Female	Male			
	9	0			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	4	5			
Disability	Yes	No			
		4			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	
				9	

11. Legal implications	
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
There are no specific legal implications relating to this proposal	
TBC	

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
July 2016	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
August / September 2016	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 28 September
October 2016	
November 2016	Full reports to Scrutiny for review
December 2016	Leading to M&C for decision on 7 December
January 2017	Transition work ongoing
February 2017	Transition work ongoing and budget set 22 February

12. Summary timetable

March 2017	Savings implemented
------------	---------------------

APPENDICES vii to x

Contents

Appendix vii Savings Summary Table

Appendix viii Specific Legal Comments

Appendix ix Corporate Savings Principles

Appendix x Making Fair Financial Decisions Guidance

Appendix xi Efficiency Plan in support of Four Year Settlement Offer

Appendix xii Summary of equality implications

APPENDIX vii

2017/18 to 2019/20 SAVINGS - SUMMARY TABLE OF NEW PROPOSALS WITH PROFORMA AT SEPT. 2016

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
A	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health							
A18 a)	A18 a) – Widening the scope for charging by removing subsidy and increasing charges	200			200	N	Y	N
A18 b)	A18 b) – Widening the scope for charging by improving income collection performance	300			300	N	N	N
A19	A19 - Workforce productivity from better use of technology	200	300		500	Y	N	N
A20	A20 - Reduction in day care offer	300	300	300	900	Y	N	N
A21 a)	A21 a) - Review levels of Mental Health expenditure, manage demand for accommodation services	300	300	400	1,000	N	N	N
A21 b)	A21 b) - Review levels of Mental Health expenditure, review implementation of s117 requirements	200			200	N	N	N
B	Supporting People							
B3	*B3 - Re-procure floating support services	500			500	N	N	N

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
E	Asset Rationalisation							
E6	E6 - Property investment acquisition	150			150	N	N	N
E7	E7 - Development of Private Rental Schemes	150	700	175	1,025	N	N	N
I	Management and Corporate Overheads							
I11 a)	I11 a) - Review insurance risks & reserves	225	50		275	N	N	N
I11 b)	I11 b) - Review insurance risks and reorganise	25			25	N	N	N
L	Culture and Community Services							
L8	L8 - Facilities management	70	130		200	N	N	Y
L9	L9 - Assemblies Fund	270			270	Y	Y	N
L10	L10 - Adult Learning Lewisham subsidy	40			40	N	N	N
M	Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services							
M3	*M3 - Housing needs restructure	61			61			
M4	M4 – PLACE / Ladywell	85			85	N	N	N
M5	M5 - Hamilton Lodge hostel income	150			150	N	N	N
M6	M6 - Reorganise provision of the Handy Persons service	150			150	Y	Y	Y

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
M7 a)	M7 a) - Reduce No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) re-provisioning housing	64			64	N	N	N
M7 b)	M7 b) – NRPF prompt claiming of Housing Benefit project	36			36	N	N	N
Q	Safeguarding and Early Intervention							
Q6 a)	Q6 a) - Developing alternative pathways for care – shared housing	170			170	Y	N	N
Q6 b)	Q6 b) - Developing alternative pathways for care – housing support	420			420	Y	N	N
Q6 c)	Q6 c) - Developing alternative pathways for care – access to public housing	500			500	Y	N	N
Q6 d)	Q6 d) - Developing alternative pathways for care – claiming of housing benefit	270			270	Y	N	N
Q6 e)	Q6 e) - Developing alternative pathways for care – contract monitoring	190			190	Y	N	N
Q6 f)	Q6 f) - Developing alternative pathways for care – improved planning		100		100	Y	N	N
Q7 a0	Q7 a) - Redesign Of Lewisham CAMHS – improve access pathways	44	50	100	194	Y	N	N

Ref.	Description	17/18 £'000	18/19 £'000	19/20 £'000	Total £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
Q7 b)	Q7 b) - Redesign Of Lewisham CAMHS – further integration work	50			50	Y	N	N
Q8	Q8 - Develop in-house fostering and specialist carers	220			220	Y	Y	N
Q9	Q9 - Enhance support for children on edge of care	495			495	Y	N	N
Q10	Q10 - Enhance family finding capacity for step down	150			150	Y	Y	N
Q11 a)	Q11 a) - Redesign of Meliot Centre - review of services at the centre	500			500	Y	N	Y
Q11 b)	Q11 b) - Redesign of Meliot Centre - develop contact centre	234			234	Y	N	N

APPENDIX viii

Specific Legal Comments

INSERT FROM LEGAL

Appendix ix

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.

Appendix x

EHRC Making Fair Financial Decisions guidance



**Equality and
Human Rights
Commission**

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.

4BWhen 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.

5BWhat 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 xi - Efficiency Plan in support of Four Year Settlement Offer

EFFICIENCY PLAN TO 2019/20 LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM – JULY 2016

1. Introduction

- 1.1. As part of the 2016/17 Local Government Finance Settlement the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to all authorities to offer them a four year financial settlement. This settlement is still subject to an annual consultation and confirmation by parliament.
- 1.2. For Lewisham this relates to the offered level of Revenue Support Grant (RSG) each year to 2019/20. To take up this offer the Council must write to the Secretary of State by the 14 October 2016 and include a link to their published efficiency plan. This paper is Lewisham's efficiency plan to 2019/20 to enable it to take the four year settlement of RSG worth £170.3m.

2. Corporate objectives

- 2.1. The Council's vision is for Lewisham to be the best place in London to live, work and learn. This vision was developed following extensive consultation with Lewisham residents, public sector agencies, local business, voluntary and community sector organisations. This vision has been adopted by all our partners.
- 2.2. In working to achieve this vision the Council is guided by two principles – 1) reducing inequality, and 2) delivering together efficiently, effectively and equitably. Delivery against these ambitions is then guided by six strategic priorities and ten corporate objectives. All the above are set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy.

3. Savings targets

- 3.1. In the seven financial years 2010/11 to 2016/17 the Council has delivered £138m of savings and used reserves in the last three years to enable it to set an annual balanced budget. For the next three years the base case from the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy identifies a further £62m of savings are likely to have to be made. This will bring the total to £200m in ten years.
- 3.2. In respect of the required £62m of savings for the years 2017/18 to 2019/20 the Council has already made good progress and continues to work hard to close the gap to put its finances on a sustainable footing. The Council's approach to this work is described below. To date £17m (27%) of the savings required have been agreed. At this time, a further £21m (34%) are the subject of proposals to be put before members in September - £6m in detail for 2017/18 and £15m in outline for the following two years. Leaving £24m (39%) still to be identified and agreed.

3.3. The budget numbers – resources, expenditure, and gap - are summarised in the table below:

London Borough of Lewisham	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
MTFS – DRAFT	£m	£m	£m	£m
Revenue Support Grant	59.6	46.2	36.9	27.6
Business Rates (retained & top up)	87.1	88.8	91.4	94.3
Council Tax*	86.6	91.4	96.5	101.8
General Fund resource	233.2	226.4	224.8	223.7
Expected spend before measures	244.1	259.3	239.4	238.2
Use of reserves	-10.9	-	-	-
Gap – annual	0	32.9	14.6	14.5
Gap – cumulative	-	32.9	47.5	62.0
Savings agreed	-	17.3	0.0	0.0
Savings proposed	-	6.5	5.8	8.7
Savings to be identified	-	9.1	8.8	5.8

* these Council Tax increases reflect assumptions about growth in the tax base and that the 2% social care precept and a 1.99% general rise are applied annually.

4. Approach to savings

4.1. In 2013 the Council established the Lewisham Future Programme as an organisation and system wide approach based on corporate control and accountability to deliver ongoing savings. The programme focuses on areas of greatest spend and common services, recognising that further years of significant spending reductions require even greater innovation, focus on the customer, and collaborative thinking to deliver savings while, if at all possible, minimising the impact on residents

4.2. In respect of the £62m of savings for the three years to 2019/20, a summary of the current savings position and where the Council is targeting its efforts, relative to net general fund budgets for these services, is set out in the table below:

Lewisham Future Programme	16/17 GF budget £m	Saving Target £m	Proposals			Gap £m
			17/18 £m	18/19 £m	19/20 £m	
Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	70.5	14.7	5.9	1.5	2.6	4.7
Supporting people (SP)	9.8	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Asset rationalisation	7.6	9.4	1.6	1.1	0.6	6.1
Enforcement & regulation	in SP above	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Management & corporate overheads	25.0	9.2	2.4	1.0	1.8	4.0
School effectiveness	1.3	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.0

Lewisham Future Programme	16/17 GF budget £m	Saving Target £m	Proposals			Gap £m
			17/18 £m	18/19 £m	19/20 £m	
Crime reduction (incl. drugs & alcohol)	in SP above	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.5
Culture & community services	11.4	4.6	3.0	0.4	0.0	1.2
Strategic housing	5.5	1.6	0.6	0.5	0.0	0.5
Environment services	18.9	5.3	1.3	0.3	1.8	1.9
Public Services – customer contact	13.5	3.9	1.4	0.0	1.9	0.6
Planning & economic development	1.4	1.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.7
Early intervention & safeguarding	47.6	6.8	3.3	0.7	0.0	2.8
Corporate cost (e.g. capital charges)	20.7	3.2	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Total	236.2	62.4	23.8*	5.8	8.7	24.1

* £17.3m of this total was agreed when 2016/17 annual budget was set.

5. Approach to transformation

5.1. To support the work of the Lewisham Future Programme and following a large scale consultation with the community (the Big Budget Challenge), in 2015 the Council adopted its Lewisham 2020 strategy. This focuses on four themes for transformation and enabling approaches to support the implementation of service reductions. They are:

- Creating the conditions where communities will be able to support themselves;
- Actively exploring all opportunities to share services;
- Digitising our services and our interactions with residents (to help simplify and manage demand); and
- Developing entrepreneurial approaches to income generation, particularly in relation to assets.

5.2. The table below summarises examples of the many savings and efficiencies made to date and planned, mapped against the transformation themes adopted by the Council. Those areas of activity to date are still relevant as work continues to extend these practices, as well as identify new efficiencies.

Transformation theme	Examples – to date	Examples - proposed
Communities supporting themselves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of successful community libraries • Volunteer engagement to maintain parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Local Assemblies to self-manage • Engage tenants to support handy person service

Transformation theme	Examples – to date	Examples - proposed
Sharing Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared operation support with other London Boroughs – IT & Comms • Employment and Skills training cross Borough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment fleet and depot services in South East London • Co-location of offices with partners – e.g. CCG
Digitising services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Citrix infrastructure and paperless office plans • Channel shift to bring more services on-line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing workforce practices to more flexible working – e.g. social work • Embed channel shift and increase automation
Managing demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More home support to lower health & care costs • Recruitment of more local foster parents • Work to support self-travel to limit transport demands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend personal budgets to lessen need for support • Focus through contracts on prevention support • Extend extra care and shared lives schemes
Income generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop own enforcement agency re debt collection • Offer extended services – e.g. trade waste, green recycling, pre-planning etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invest in developing housing supply – e.g. PRS, short-term & hostels • Extend use of open spaces for events • Improve timely and efficient debt collection

5.3. In addition to the approaches noted above the savings numbers to be delivered also continue to require rigorous work on cost control in all areas (e.g. use of agency staff, contract management etc..) and an acceptance of more service and financial risk through leaner corporate governance, risk and control arrangements.

6. Risk considerations

6.1. The risk landscape facing local authorities continues to change as a result of policy and practice. All of which bring further financial uncertainty and pressure to bear on plans and may require further and more radical efficiencies to be made.

6.2. A summary of the risks and opportunities being monitored and managed by the Council include:

National	London	Lewisham
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move to 100% self-financing via Council Tax and Business Rates (plus appeals and 2015 valuation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> London devolution proposals re business rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer discretionary services and more rationed statutory services impact sense of place and community cohesion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devolution of new responsibilities to local government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport priorities such as the Bakerloo line extension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population growth creating service demands – e.g. need for housing, schools, social care etc..
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to New Homes Bonus scheme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisation and governance of health & care services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporate governance, risk and control tested e.g. workforce resilience, financial tolerance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of improved Better Care Fund monies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of travel, e.g. concessionary scheme 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New apprenticeship levy – workforce & cost implications 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More schools to academy and funding changes 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further public sector spending cuts to unprotected areas 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic climate impacts investment decisions 		

7. Financial sustainability

7.1. As the Council continues to make significant budget cuts it is increasingly juggling the challenges from taking more risk while avoiding service or financial failure. To help manage the timing and scale of this challenge the Council sets aside monies and uses reserves to balance the budget.

7.2. In respect of timing, the Council identifies £7.5m annually to be allocated to specific service risks and pressures as they emerge from setting the budget and regular financial and performance monitoring through the year. In addition, the Council has been putting the New Homes Bonus it receives into reserves, rather than directly into the base budget while the scheme's future remains uncertain, and drawing on this to meet demand.

7.3. In terms of scale, the Council has been using earmarked reserves to support investments, redundancies and change. For example; the

Council continues to make capital investments in school places and different types of housing provision, and investments in services such as IT and fleet. And the Council has run three voluntary severance schemes in the last five years.

8. Related documents

8.1. Other published documents related to this plan include:

Sustainable Community Strategy

<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/strategies/Documents/Sustainable%20Community%20Strategy%202008-2020.pdf>

Budget for 2016/17

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s41570/2016%2017%20Budget.pdf>

Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2019/20

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=123&MIId=4155>

Strategic Asset Management Plan

<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/strategies/Documents/150330%20SAMP%20Final.docx>

Corporate Budget Book 2016/17

<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/finances/Documents/Corporate%20Budget%20Book%202016%E2%80%9317.pdf>

[Lewisham 2020 5 year forward view](http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s39593/Lewisham%202020%205%20year%20Forward%20view.pdf)

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s39593/Lewisham%202020%205%20year%20Forward%20view.pdf>

END

Appendix xii – Summary of Equalities Implications

Context

The Lewisham Future Programme 2016/17 report sets out options in 20 proposals (excluding B3 and M3 and the separate Public Health proposals – see report) with a total value of £6.4m of savings for pre-decision scrutiny prior to Mayor and Cabinet on 28 September 2016. As part of the budget setting process, equality assessment analysis of selected budget savings is carried out to better understand the likely impact on protected groups and, where possible, to mitigate any negative effects.

An initial assessment of the likely impact of changes on protected groups is carried out during the development of each savings proposal. A determination is also made as to whether the proposal, should it be agreed, would require a full equalities analysis assessment. This information is presented in section eight of each proforma (appended to the budget savings report).

The Public Sector Equality Duty requires the Council to 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.

Characteristics¹ covered by the Equality Duty are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- The duty also covers marriage and civil partnerships, but only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination within employment and training.

The Council is required to demonstrate that it has had ‘due regard’ to the aims of the Equality Duty in decision-making. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which the Council can demonstrate that it has had ‘due regard’.

Lewisham’s has a comprehensive equalities scheme (2012-16) which is based on the principles set out in the borough’s sustainable communities’ strategy. The scheme brings together information and intelligence about the Council’s strategic approach to equality and states the Council’s commitment to achieving these five objectives:

- Tackling victimisation, harassment and discrimination
- Improving access to services
- Closing the gap in outcomes for citizens
- Increasing understanding and mutual respect between communities
- Increasing participation and engagement

Having due regard to the requirements of the public sector equality duty and having consideration of the objectives of the Comprehensive Equalities Scheme, it has been agreed that the assessment of the impact on equality should be focused on, and proportionate to, decisions being made.

Where proposals are anticipated to have an impact on staffing levels, they are subject to consultation as set out in the Council's employment policies, and services will be required to undertake an Equalities Analysis Assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process.

These proposals are identified as aligning to the Council's corporate priorities as follows:

Corporate Priority	Proposals - primary impact by number and value			
	Number	%	£'000	%
1. Community leadership and empowerment	2	10%	470	7%
2. Young people's achievement and involvement	0	0%	0	0%
3. Clean, green and liveable	0	0%	0	0%
4. Safety, security and a visible presence	0	0%	0	0%
5. Strengthening the local economy	0	0%	0	0%
6. Decent homes for all	3	15%	385	6%
7. Protection of children	7	35%	3,193	50%
8. Caring for adults and the older people	4	20%	1,800	28%
9. Active, healthy citizens	1	5%	40	1%
10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness	2	10%	400	6%
No known	1	5%	150	2%
Total	20	100%	6,438	100%

Of these 20 proposals they were assessed by impact and severity as follows

Impact	No	%	Severity	No	%
Positive	5	25%	High	0	0%
Neutral	9	45%	Medium	16	80%
Negative	5	25%	Low	3	15%
Not known	1	5%	Not known	1	5%
Total	20	100%	Total	20	100%

Of the proposals five were identified as Negative and Medium and five as Positive and Medium with the others in between.

Overall from an equalities perspective and the potential impact on service users, the 20 proposals were assessed as follows*

Overall equalities assessment on service users*		
Likely impact	Number	%
High	0	0%
Medium	4	20%
Low	9	45%
Not known or Not applicable	7	35%
Total	20	100%

*NB these assessment are before any consultation where required with service users to evaluate these initial assumptions.

In respect of the potential specific equalities implications from proposals directly impacting the public, the following was identified against six (or 30%) of the proposals (with a value of £1.7m or 28% of the total value of the proposals).

Protected characteristics	Proposals – possible High or Medium impact			
	High	Medium	Total	Comment
Ethnicity	1	2	3	
Gender	1	2	3	
Age	3	1	4	
Disability	3	2	5	
Religion / Belief	0	0	0	
Pregnancy / Maternity	0	0	0	
Marriage & Civil Partnerships	0	0	0	
Sexual orientation	0	0	0	
Gender reassignment	0	0	0	
No known at this time	1	0	1	L9
Total	9	7	16	

As only six proposals were identified as having potential High or Medium equality implications, 70% of the proposals are identified as having a low level of impact or the equalities implications are judged not to be applicable (or assessment unnecessary).

Officers were also asked to consider the potential geographical impacts of the budget savings proposals. In all cases, no specific ward impact has been identified.

Conclusion

Corporate Priorities

- The two main corporate priorities impacted by these proposals are the protection of children and caring for adults and older people, 55% by number of proposals and 78% by value. None of the proposals are judged to have a high impact on the corporate priorities and the balance between positive and negative impacts is roughly equal.

Equalities

- Six of the proposals were identified as having potential high or medium impacts on service users, all in the areas of age, disability, ethnicity and gender. None of the proposals were judged as having a high equalities impact overall.