

# Children and Young People Select Committee Supplementary Agenda

Wednesday, 1 November 2017

**7.00 pm**, Committee Room 1

Civic Suite

Lewisham Town Hall

London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Emma Aye-Kumi (020 8314 9534) (Tel: 020 8314 9534)

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

## Part 1

<b>Item</b>		<b>Pages</b>
6.	Lewisham Future Programme - savings and overspend	3 - 88

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Children and Young People Select Committee</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	Lewisham Future Programme 2018/19 Revenue Budget Savings Report		
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	<b>Item No.</b>	6
<b>Ward</b>	All Wards		
<b>Contributors</b>	Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date:</b>	<b>1 November 2017</b>

**Lateness:** This report was not available for the original dispatch because officers needed additional time to complete their review of possible savings.

**Urgency:** The report is urgent and cannot wait until the next meeting of the Mayor & Cabinet to enable any savings decisions to be implemented promptly to achieve a full year effect and influence the preparation of the budget report for Mayor and Cabinet on the 7 February 2018.

Where a report is received less than 5 clear days before the date of the meeting at which the matter is being considered, then under the Local Government Act 1972 Section 100(b)(4) the Chair of the Committee can take the matter as a matter of urgency if he is satisfied that there are special circumstances requiring it to be treated as a matter of urgency. These special circumstances have to be specified in the minutes of the meeting.

## 1. PURPOSE

- 1.1. To set out the officer revenue budget savings proposals to be considered by Scrutiny, and need to be approved as part of the preparation of a balanced budget for 2018/19.

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1. The Council's net General Fund budget for 2017/18 is £232.7m. This is based on using reserves for the fourth consecutive year to balance the budget and follows three years of Directorates overspending, in part due to the delivery of savings becoming harder. The current Directorate projections for 2017/18 are for an overspend of over £13m, of which £7m relates to previously agreed but as yet unachieved savings.
- 2.2. To put the Council's finances on a sustainable footing, the Medium Term Financial Strategy identifies the need for £33m of ongoing savings in the two years to 2019/22 - £22m in 2018/19 and £11m in 2019/20. This is on top of the need to address the persistent in-year overspend in Directorate budgets.

- 2.3. The MTF5 anticipates that post 2020 approximately £10m per year of savings will be required. These savings projections remains an estimate pending confirmation of any policy, funding, or wider implications from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Autumn Budget in November and Local Government Finance Settlement announcement in December. And the next Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR), expected in 2020.
- 2.4. From 2010 to 2020 this will bring the total savings made and required to £193m, of which £160m have been agreed with £153m delivered and £7m in the forecast overspend. This report concentrates on the £40m - £7m to be delivered (agreed and part of the 2017/18 budget) and the £33m to be identified (£22m in 2018/19 and £11m in 2019/20).
- 2.5. Through the Lewisham Future Programme approach officers have worked hard to identify possible new savings proposals towards meeting these savings targets. In so doing, targets by work strand have been set on a differential basis to protect front-line services where possible.
- 2.6. The detail presented in this report identifies potential savings proposals from officers of £4.85m. By work strand these are:

Savings proposals for 2018/19	Prev. agreed	New proposals	Total	Target	Gap
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
A - Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	300		<b>300</b>	6,100	<b>-5,800</b>
B - Supporting People		70	<b>70</b>	0	70
D – Efficiency Review		1,000	<b>1,000</b>	0	1,000
E - Asset rationalisation		500	<b>500</b>	4,400	<b>-3,900</b>
I - Management & corporate overhead		1,290	<b>1,290</b>	3,300	<b>-2,010</b>
J - School effectiveness		360	<b>360</b>	600	<b>-240</b>
K - Drugs & alcohol		30	<b>30</b>	0	30
L- Culture & community services	130		<b>130</b>	1,000	<b>-870</b>
M - Strategic housing		250	<b>250</b>	600	<b>-350</b>
N Environment services			<b>0</b>	2,300	<b>-2,300</b>
O - Public Services		500	<b>500</b>	1,400	<b>-900</b>
P - Planning & economic development		270	<b>270</b>	600	<b>-330</b>
Q - Early intervention & safeguarding	150		<b>150</b>	1,700	<b>-1,550</b>
<b>Proposals</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>4,270</b>	<b>4,850</b>	<b>22,000</b>	<b>-17,150</b>

- 2.7. Proformas are provided for the new savings for 2018/19 and are appended to this report.
- 2.8. At this stage, if all these savings proposals are agreed and there are no surprises from the local government finance settlement in December, the Council's budget for 2018/19 would need to be set using £17.15m of reserves. By not overstating the level of possible savings at this stage this will hopefully give services the time to address the 2017/18 overspends and consolidate and extend the service changes already in train.
- 2.9. Overall the strategic direction for services in terms of the Lewisham Future Programme and Lewisham 2020 themes remains sound. Management focus is on:
- Catching up and delivering unachieved savings from 2017/18 and taking management action to bring overspends back in-line with budgets;
  - Continuing the work to manage demand, improve service effectiveness and efficiency, and generate income to bring the return for this work through the financial monitoring in 2018/19; and
  - Work on bringing forward further proposals to close this gap as soon as possible, including through 2018/19 so that part year effects can be taken.
- 2.10. Finally, the report notes that the Public Health savings are being made separate and 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 as part of the work outlined above.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1. The scrutiny committees are asked to:
- 3.1.1. Note the progress with identifying savings, the £17m shortfall against the target for 2018/19, and the implications for the use of reserves.
- 3.1.2. Review the new savings proposals presented in Section 9 and Appendices i to xii, totalling £4.3m and referenced: B4; D2; E8; I12, 13, 14, & 15; J3; K5; M8; O5; and P3.
- 3.1.3. Note the previously agreed savings for 2018/19 in Section 11, totalling £0.6m and referenced: A19; L8; and Q6 & 7.
- 3.1.4. Note the update on progress in relation to Public Health savings in Section 12.
- 3.1.5. Make any recommendations to the Public Accounts Select Committee for referral to Mayor & Cabinet.

#### **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 net General Fund budget for the current financial year, 2017/18, of £232.7m. The schools Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) are discrete and so do not form part of this savings report.

5.2. In addition, the Council receives and spends other income and grants for General Fund services which are budgeted for on a net nil basis – i.e. expenditure matches the level of income. These include: Public Health, Better Care Fund & improved Better Care Fund, fees and charges; and various grants for areas such as troubled families and homelessness. Any overspend in these areas has to be met from other resources in the General Fund.

- 5.3. In 2016/17 the Council ended the financial year with a Directorate overspend position of £9m with the largest pressures being in the areas of Children's Social Care, Joint Commissioning, Adult Social Care, and Environment. These pressures arise from a combination of the:
- Impact of government policy changes;
  - Market developments and responses to inspection findings;
  - Demand pressures as the population of Lewisham grows; and
  - Difficulties in delivering agreed savings with the full financial impact.
- 5.4. The 2017/18 budget is under pressure from the need to deliver services within the available level of financial resource and identify further savings. The 2017/18 budget was set using £5m of reserves as insufficient savings were agreed. This savings shortfall is carried forward and forms part of the £22m target for 2018/19. Furthermore, Directorates are currently forecasting an end of year overspend in the region of £13m, including £7m of as yet unachieved savings. Any overspend also has to be met from the use of the Council's once-off reserves and provisions.
- 5.5. In the eight years between 2010/11 and 2017/18 the Council has agreed savings of £160m of which £153m have been delivered and £7m form part of the forecast overspend for 2017/18 as noted above.
- 5.6. In July 2017, the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) was presented to members. This referenced a number of risks, the likelihood and impacts of which remain uncertain. The main risks are in the areas of:
- government policy and funding changes;
  - development and changes for London via the devolution agenda;
  - employment and business prospects impacting the local tax take; and
  - demographic change and the wider social implications resulting from the above.
- 5.7. For 2018/19 and beyond, to put the Council's finances on a sustainable footing, the MTFS identifies the need for £33m of ongoing savings in the two years to 2019/20 – split £22m in 2018/19 and £11m in 2019/20.
- 5.8. The MTFS also anticipates that post 2020 approximately £10m per year of savings will be required. These longer dated savings projections remain uncertain pending confirmation of any policy, funding, or wider economic changes. These estimates will be revisited for any implications from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Autumn Budget in November and Local Government Finance Settlement announcement in December. And, looking further ahead, for the next Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) expected in 2020.

## **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 x), 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. This involves looking at the anticipated savings required for the five years to 22/23, considering the finances available, growth and other pressures on Council services, and other wider social and economic risks and opportunities. The MTFs identifies a base line savings requirement of £52m over the next five years, equivalent to a reduction of 22% from the 2017/18 net General Fund budget of £232m.
- 6.3. Given the level of uncertainty noted in the financial context above, targets by work strand have only been set for the next two years, to 2019/20. These total £33m and will take the Council to the end of the current four year settlement from Government to 2019/20. As in previous years, the Lewisham Future Programme continues to try and protect front line services where possible and fairly reflect what has been delivered to date.

Work strand and savings target as % of net General Fund budget		£m
<b>A</b>	Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health	-9.2
<b>B</b>	Supporting people	-0.0
<b>D</b>	Efficiency	-0.0
<b>E</b>	Asset rationalisation	-6.6
<b>H</b>	Enforcement & regulation	-0.0
<b>I</b>	Management & corporate overheads	-4.9
<b>J</b>	School effectiveness	-0.9
<b>K</b>	Crime reduction	-0.0
<b>L</b>	Culture & community services	-1.5
<b>M</b>	Housing strategy & non-HRA services	-0.9
<b>N</b>	Environmental services	-3.4
<b>O</b>	Public services	-2.1
<b>P</b>	Planning & economic development	-0.9
<b>Q</b>	Safeguarding & early intervention services	-2.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>-33.0</b>

- 6.4. As for 2017/18 the cross cutting work strands C, F & G have not been set targets. These areas, include business and customer transformation, shared services, and income generation. 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

- 6.6. 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 (see Appendix x).
- 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 2017/18 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.
- 8.2. The Lewisham 2020 themes 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.

8.3. The table below summarises examples of savings made to date and proposed (as set out in this report) by Lewisham 2020 transformation theme.

Transformation theme	Examples - proposed
<b>Communities supporting themselves</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None at this time</li> </ul>
<b>Sharing Services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None at this time</li> </ul>
<b>Digitising services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing enterprise resource planning system for finance, HR &amp; payroll processes</li> </ul>
<b>Managing demand</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offering better housing solutions for those in temporary accommodation</li> </ul>
<b>Income generation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve accuracy of single person discount claims</li> <li>• Planning Services</li> </ul>

8.4. 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 £4m of savings presented in overview in this section all relate to the savings required of £22m in 2018/19. The £0.6m of previously agreed savings for 2018/19 that also contribute to this target are recapped in Section 11 below.

9.2. As there is a substantial gap in the level of savings proposed against the target required for 2018/19, the current financial position and ongoing work is also presented by work strand.

**A Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health**

Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
112.9	-44.3	<b>68.6</b>	<b>-6.1</b>

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).
- 9.5. The gross level of expenditure reflects the level of annual Better Care Fund and improved Better Care Fund monies, income from self-funding clients, and other grants for these services. The net budget includes the contribution from the Adult Social Care precept raised as part of the Council Tax which is meeting the above inflationary rises to the London Living Wage.
- 9.6. The Adult Social Care Precept (ASCP) was levied in 2016/17 at 2% on Council Tax and in 2017/18 at 3%. Going into 2018/19 this has added £4.6m to the service budget. As part of the four year settlement with Government to 2019/20 the Council can levy a further 3% on Council Tax for the ASCP. The MTFS assumes this will be done by 1% on 2018/19 and 2% in 2019/20.

#### Savings

- 9.7. In 2017/18 the service is forecasting an overspend of £1m which includes unachieved savings of £3m which have slipped.
- 9.8. Work continues to deliver these savings as planned. The savings are dependent on delivery of the extra care housing schemes, effective care planning, managing commissioning and market stability, and service reorganisations to take advantage of the systems upgrade and digital transformation work currently underway.
- 9.9. This service area is very dependent of the good working relationships with partners and there is a lot of potential change in respect of the integration of health and care governance, financing and operational arrangements, both locally and at the south east London regional level. This complicates planning.
- 9.10. No new savings are proposed at this time as the work still in progress needs to be concluded and the impact evaluated to avoid any unintended consequences. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £6.1m for this workstrand.

## **B – Supporting People**

#### Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
17.6	-8.2	<b>9.4</b>	<b>-0.0</b>

### Scope

- 9.11. 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

- 9.12. This service are is current forecasting a balanced budget for 2017/18.
- 9.13. No further savings target has been set for this area in 2018/19 following the re-procurement of contracts in recent years. This will be kept under review. Nonetheless the service is proposing one saving for £70k in respect of service rental income.

### Risks

- 9.14. The risk of taking this approach is felt to be minimal at 1% of the budget.

### Summary

- 9.15. The potential saving for work strand B – is:

D – Efficiency Review	18/19 £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
<b>B4 – Service economy rental income</b>	70	N	N	N

- 9.16. Please see appendix i for the saving proforma B4.

## **D Efficiency Review**

### Budget

- 9.17. No specific budget applies to this work strand and as such no savings target has been attributed. However, as set out in the MTFs, allowance is made in the financial modelling for the budget for annual inflationary increases. For 2018/19 these are £1.1m for pay and £2.6m for non-pay expenditure.

### Savings

9.18. For the past four years the allocation of inflation has been reduced by £2.5m annually as a general cost control measure. It is now proposed to reduce the levels of inflationary growth allocated to services by £1.0m when setting the base budgets for 2018/19.

#### Risks

9.19. The risk to achieving this saving is that services will not be able to contain their expenditure within the tighter limits, either on staffing costs (including agency spend) or contract expenditure, resulting in an overspend.

#### Summary

9.20. The potential saving for work strand D – is:

D – Efficiency Review	18/19 £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
D2 – reduction in allocated inflation	1,000	Y	N	N

9.21. Please see appendix i for the saving proforma D2.

### **E Asset rationalisation**

#### Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
47.7	-40.4	<b>7.3</b>	<b>-4.4</b>

#### Scope

9.22. 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

- 9.23. This service are is forecasting an overspend of £0.6m for 2017/18, mainly due to shortfalls income from utilities companies for licensed work and advertising income.
- 9.24. While not delivered exactly as profiled, the service has delivered the budget reductions agreed as savings in previous years. Given the scale of the Council’s assets and landlord commitments, any significant future savings will need to come as income from development rather than cost reduction. By its nature such development is complex and takes time, many years, to bring forward.
- 9.25. As part of this work is ongoing to bring forward Private Rented Scheme (PRS) development options as a means to generating additional income for the Council while also providing additional housing stock in the Borough.
- 9.26. **E8** – Establishment of Joint Venture to develop Besson Street PRS - £0.5m
  - Subject to the Mayor and Cabinet decision on the Besson Street procurement in December 2017, it is anticipated that the value realised from the proposed partnership will start to accrue from 2018/19.

Risks

- 9.27. The risks and challenges to achieving these savings will be the ability to appraise, design, procure, partner and deliver developments at pace and in line with the Council’s, often competing, financial, economic development, planning and social objectives.

Summary

- 9.28. The potential saving for work strand E – is:

E – Asset Rationalisation	18/19 £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
<b>E8</b> – income from PRS joint venture for Besson St.	500	Y	N	N

- 9.29. Please see appendix ii for the saving proforma E8. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £3.9m for this work strand.

**H Enforcement & regulation**

- 9.30. 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. Some aspects of this service, in particular food standards, are subject to

external inspection and the approach now in place is proven but with concerns noted for any further reductions. The service performance is being monitored before further risks and savings are considered.

## I Management & corporate overheads

### Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
22.4	-5.7	<b>16.7</b>	<b>-3.3</b>

### Scope

- 9.31. 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

- 9.32. Most of these services are spending to budget in 2017/18. The main exception is Information Technology where an overspend of £1.2m is forecast. This has arisen due to: 1) the higher than expected costs to complete the digital upgrade work as part of making Lewisham's technology fit for purpose going into the shared service with the London Borough of Brent; and 2) lower than expected savings from the expansion of the shared service to include other partners, most recently the London Borough of Southwark.
- 9.33. From this starting point, the four savings proposed in this work strand continue the rigorous focus on tightening up procedures to increase productivity and realise further efficiencies. They are:
- 9.34. **I12** – Administration budget cut - £0.02m
- Further reduce the administrative budget to support senior management
- 9.35. **I13** – More efficient and effective finance processes - £0.2m
- Following the move to Oracle Cloud as part of the 'Invest to Save' work to implement an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, revisit the finance operating model and procedures to streamline processes.
- 9.36. **I14** – Loss of the Police Officer secondment - £0.07m
- In 2017/18 the Police Officer secondment programme was ended by the Metropolitan Police Service.
- 9.37. **I15** – Review of accounting policies in respect of the balance sheet - £1.0m

- As part of the Treasury Management Strategy review the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision policy and re-evaluate the appropriate levels required in line with current asset valuations to remain prudent.

### Risks

- 9.38. 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 remain particularly acute in the area of management and corporate overheads as the Council has emphasised savings from these corporate support functions and their related activities in services (e.g. local finance, technology and business support activities) to protect front line services to citizens.

### Summary

- 9.39. The savings being proposed for work strand I – are:

I – Management & corporate overheads	18/19 £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
<b>I12</b> – Administration budget cut	20	N	N	N
<b>I13</b> – More efficient and effective finance processes	200	N	N	Y
<b>I14</b> – Loss of the Police Officer secondment	70	N	N	N
<b>I15</b> – Review of accounting policies in respect of the balance sheet	1,000	Y	N	N

- 9.40. Please see appendix iii to vi for the saving proforma proposals I12 to I15. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £2.0m for this work strand.

## **J School effectiveness**

### Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
2.6	-1.1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>-0.6</b>

### Scope

- 9.41. The Service includes all functions related to raising standards of achievement in schools; governors; elective home education; the Attendance and Welfare service; improving schools' and settings' capacity to meet the needs and raise



standards for all children. The Service also includes Looked After Children education, Not in Education or Employment Training (NEET) reduction, a traded HR service for schools and places planning and delivery of those places across early years, mainstream school places and Special Education Needs (SEN) places.

### Savings

- 9.42. The service is currently spending to budget. While it is not anticipated that the Council's statutory duties for schools, and particularly safeguarding within them, will be removed schools funding is to be channelled to them directly. This is likely to change the relationship and level of engagement the Council has with schools and the related costs or recharges appropriate for the Council's work with schools in future.
- 9.43. The savings proposed for this are:
- 9.44. **J3** – Statutory functions for school effectiveness - £0.36m
- The Department for Education (DfE) has moved the grant supporting statutory education services to the schools.

### Risks

- 9.45. The risks to this service include the demographic pressures with a growing number of children and young people in London, a rising level of need for additional support in schools with a high level of pupils eligible for free school meals, and the national funding formula changes which is putting cost pressures on Lewisham schools.

### Summary

- 9.46. The savings being proposed for work strand J – are:

<b>J – School Effectiveness</b>	<b>18/19 £'000</b>	<b>Key decision</b>	<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Staff consultation</b>
<b>J3 – Statutory functions for school effectiveness</b>	360	?	?	?

- 9.47. Please see appendix vii for the saving proforma for proposal J3. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £0.24m for this work strand.

## **K Crime reduction**

### Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
3.1	-1.2	2.9	-0.0

### Scope

- 9.48. The service is focused on Crime reduction, safer neighbourhood initiatives and CCTV. Supporting children and young people who are involved in or are the victims of crime.

### Savings

- 9.49. No savings target has been set for this area as it is now almost entirely covered by the overlap with decisions on public health spending and reliance on London Mayoral funding. Overall the service is on budget but experiencing some pressures from Youth Justice and Remand costs.
- 9.50. However, a saving for £30k is proposed to reduce the allocated resource to support problem solving processes which could require small amounts of resources to deliver and tackle problems identified throughout the year.

### Risks

- 9.51. The risk of taking this approach will be slower and less flexible response from the Council impacting users and partners.

### Summary

- 9.52. The potential saving for work strand K – is:

K – Crime Reduction	18/19 £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
<b>K5 – Reduce budget for problem solving support</b>	30	N	N	N

- 9.53. Please see appendix **i** for the saving proforma K5.

## **L Culture & community services**

### Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
16.5	-7.2	<b>9.3</b>	<b>-1.0</b>

#### Scope

- 9.54. 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

- 9.55. The service is on budget for 2017/18 with a previously agreed saving for 2018/19 – see Section 11 below. The majority of services here fall into those described in Section 10 below and no savings are proposed at this time.
- 9.56. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £1.4m for this work strand.

### **M Housing strategy & non-HRA services**

#### Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
26.5	-20.9	<b>5.6</b>	<b>-0.6</b>

#### Scope

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

#### Savings

- 9.58. The service is on budget for 2017/18 but with some variations in spending by area as welfare reforms impact and housing developments come on stream. The saving proposed is:
- 9.59. **M8** - Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation - £0.25m
- This will be achieved by focusing on demand, cost, and developing more suitable alternative accommodation.

#### Risks

- 9.60. 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.

Summary

9.61. The savings being proposed for work strand M – are:

<b>M – Housing strategy and non HRA services</b>	<b>18/19 £'000</b>	<b>Key decision</b>	<b>Public consultation</b>	<b>Staff consultation</b>
<b>M8 – Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation</b>	250	N	N	N

9.62. Please see appendix viii for the saving proforma for proposal M8. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £0.3m for this work strand.

**N Environmental services**

Budget

<b>2017/18 Budget book</b>			<b>Savings target for 2018/19 £m</b>
<b>Gross Exp. £m</b>	<b>Income £m</b>	<b>Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m</b>	
35.9	-17.5	<b>18.5</b>	<b>-2.3</b>

Scope

9.63. 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

9.64. The service is forecasting an overspend of £2m in 2017/18. This is due to unachieved savings due to the delayed implementation of savings in respect of service changes and anticipated income streams, and rising contract and waste disposal costs.

9.65. A review of shared service options for refuse collection and the depot is underway but these are longer dated to deliver. An added complexity is that the Wearside depot site may be impacted by the Bakerloo Line extension. Transport for London (TfL) recently consulted on proposals for a ventilation and access shaft on the north eastern part of the Wearside depot site, together with a wider piece of land around this shaft for a works site. TfL are also proposing that overrun tunnels, which provide parking for trains that

are not in operation, be located underneath this portion of the depot site. These tunnels may assist in the potential second phase of the Bakerloo Line extension from Lewisham to Hayes. This could have an impact on the future use of the site.

- 9.66. The focus is on delivering these previously agreed savings and exploring the potential future strategic options for the service. No new savings are proposed at this time. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £2.3m for this service.

## **O Public services**

### Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
14.7	-2.4	<b>12.3</b>	<b>-1.4</b>

### Scope

- 9.67. 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

- 9.68. The service is currently overspending by £1m in 2017/18 mainly due to income shortfalls, cost of collection, and adjusting to less administration grant while also implementing Universal Credit. It is anticipate that management actions already in train will correct this position by 2018/19.
- 9.69. Management is working on extending these efficiencies through further automation of online forms to support channel shift, changing customer engagement and practices, and improving debt collection practices.
- 9.70. The saving proposed for 2018/19 relates to debt collection and is:
- 9.71. **O5** – Council tax single person discount review - £0.5m
- Following a more detailed data matching exercise on those claiming this discount it is expected that more Council Tax will now be collected.

### Risks

- 9.72. The general risks and challenges to achieving savings in this area are the ability to communicate and change user expectations and the routes to

engaging with the Council. This should also improve compliance and limit the opportunities for customers to incorrectly present their circumstances

### Summary

9.73. The saving being proposed for work strand O – is:

O – Public Services	18/19 £'000	Key decision	Public consultation	Staff consultation
<b>O5 – Council tax single person discount review</b>	500	N	N	N

9.74. Please see appendix viii for the saving proforma for proposal O9. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £0.9m for this work strand.

## **P Planning & economic development**

### Budget

2016/17 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
2.6	-1.6	<b>1.0</b>	<b>-0.6</b>

### Scope

9.75. 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

9.76. The service is currently forecasting a small underspend for 2017/18 due to slightly higher than anticipated income. As housing and planning policies continue to change and developments in Lewisham mature it is anticipated that the service will be able to generate more income.

9.77. The proposal is for the service to target additional income of £270k in 2018/19.

### Risks

- 9.78. 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.
- 9.79. Please see appendix xii for the saving proforma for proposal K5. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £0.3m for this workstrand.

**Q Safeguarding & early intervention services**

Budget

2017/18 Budget book			Savings target for 2018/19 £m
Gross Exp. £m	Income £m	Net Gen. Fund Exp. £m	
38.5	-0.8	<b>37.7</b>	<b>-1.7</b>

Scope

- 9.80. 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.
- 9.81. 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

- Overspending by £7.5m across children social care by £5.6m and targeted services/early intervention by £1.9m
  - Some £1m of undelivered savings and savings strategy focused on strengthened MASH arrangements and more local fostering options
- 9.82. In 2017/18 the service is forecasting an overspend of £7.5m which includes unachieved savings of £1m which have slipped. Overspending on these services is a recognised pressure for councils nationally.
- 9.83. The bulk of the overspend reflects higher than expected demand for these services which drives overspending on both staffing budgets to manage the work and through the cost of placements and support. In the long run the decisions in the MASH will help manage this demand and flow through to placements.
- 9.84. Consistent with the strategic direction established by the service following the Ofsted review in 2016/17, work is ongoing to better understand the data and

performance of current social work practices to influence decision making and the allocation of resources to help reduce reliance on agency staff and the number and the cost of placements through earlier and alternative less costly interventions where possible. This is being supported by the digital transformation work in progress to improve systems and service information.

- 9.85. No new savings are proposed at this time as the work still in progress needs to be concluded. This leaves a savings gap for 2018/19 of £1.7m for this workstrand.

## 10. OTHER AREAS

### Discretionary spend

- 10.1. In preparing the above there is over £10m of discretionary spend which has not been put forward for further consideration at this stage.
- 10.2. These budgets are for valued services. However, with some minimum statutory obligations, they 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 discretionary spend areas may also need to be revisited before 2019/20.

## 11. PREVIOUSLY AGREED SAVINGS

- 11.1. In September 2016, the Mayor agreed savings for 2018/19. These, totalling £0.580m, are tabled below and re-presented to the Mayor for noting and re-endorsement:

### Previously Agreed 2018/19 Revenue Budget Savings Proposals

Ref.	Description	2018/19 £'000
<b>A</b>	<b>Smarter &amp; deeper integration of social care &amp; health</b>	
A19	Workforce productivity from better technology	300
<b>L</b>	<b>Culture and Community Services</b>	
L8	Facilities management – retender of contract for Deptford Lounge	130
<b>Q</b>	<b>Safeguarding and Early Intervention</b>	
Q6	Developing alternative pathways for care – improved planning	100
Q7	Redesign of CAMHS	50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>

## 12. PUBLIC HEALTH



- 12.1. Following the Spending Review and Autumn Statement 2015 the Government announced further cuts to funding for public health services and a continuing of the ring fence. In 2017/18 the additional responsibility for early years health visiting was transferred to local authorities as part of the public health funding.
- 12.2. For Lewisham, while the annual reduction is less than for the general fund, there is still a requirement of for an annual 2.6% reduction, or £0.7m, per year.
- 12.3. The proposals for reducing public health spending are being managed by the Community Services Directorate under the scrutiny of the Healthier Select Committee. For 2018/19 the saving of £0.7m is expected to be largely met through the shared services work across London to align and reduce tariffs for sexual health services.

### 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.	1 Nov	1 Nov	9 Nov	16 Nov	2 Nov	8 Nov
M&C	6 December					

- 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 19th December 2017.
- 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 2018/19. 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.	11 Dec	30 Nov	14 Dec	20 Dec	13 Dec	14 Dec
M&C	10 January 2018					
Select Ctte.	30 Jan	24 Jan	31 Jan	6 Feb + Budget	25 Jan	18 Jan
M&C	7 Feb + Budget					

- 13.4. The Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel for these rounds will be 23 January and 20 February respectively.
- 13.5. In addition to the above, further proposals will need to be presented for decision during 2018/19, 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**

### **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 Legislation**

- 15.4. The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following 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. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other prohibited conduct, or to promote equality of opportunity or foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. It is a duty to have due regard to the need to achieve the goals listed in the paragraph above.
- 15.7. The weight to be attached to the duty will be dependent on the nature of the decision and the circumstances in which it is made. This is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. The Mayor must understand the impact or likely impact of the decision on those with protected characteristics who are potentially affected by the decision. The extent of the duty will necessarily vary from case to case and due regard is such regard as is appropriate in all the circumstances.
- 15.8. The Equality and Human Rights Commission has 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:

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/equality-act-codes-practice>

15.9. <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/equality-act-technical-guidance>

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

- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty.
- Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making.
- Engagement and the equality duty: A guide for public authorities.
- Objectives and the equality duty. A guide for public authorities.
- Equality Information and the Equality Duty: A Guide for Public Authorities.

15.11. 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:  
<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty-guidance#h1>

15.12. The EHRC has also issued Guidance entitled “Making Fair Financial Decisions”.  
<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/making-fair-financial-decisions>. It appears at Appendix ix and attention is drawn to its contents.

15.13. The equalities implications pertaining to the specific service reductions are particular to the specific reduction.

15.14. 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 xi presents that information for ease of reference.

### **The Human Rights Act**

15.15. 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.

15.16. 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

15.17. 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**

15.18. 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**

15.19. 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**

15.20. 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**

15.21. Members’ attention is drawn to the specific legal implications arising in relation to particular proposals set out in this report in Appendices i to ix.

## **EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

15.22. Each new saving proposal reviews the potential equalities implications for those impacted. In this case, with one exception, they are all Low or Not Applicable (N/A). The assessed medium impact is in respect of the crime reduction proposal, K5. Subject to being agreed, these assessments will be kept under review as the services are implemented.

15.23. They current assessed equality implications for new proposals are as follows:

- **B4** Supporting People – Low as a 1% budget reduction
- **D2** Efficiency review – Low as applied evenly and proportionally across all areas of spend.
- **E8** Develop PRS – N/A as such schemes are in the market.
- **I12** Admin budget cut – N/A as this is not a service budget
- **I13** Finance restructure – Low and any staff change will be managed in line with the Council’s HR policy for managing change
- **I14** Police Officer – N/A as this was an external scheme that had been cancelled
- **I15** MRP review – N/A as this is a technical accounting review
- **J3** School effectiveness – N/A as this is a funding change and not a service reduction
- **K5** problem solving – Medium as, while a small saving, this limits flexibility of service and partners
- **M8** less nightly paid – Low and positive as will help people into better accommodation
- **O5** Council Tax collection – N/A as no change to the policy
- **P3** Planning income – N/A as choice to use the service is discretionary

## **16. CONCLUSION**

16.1. The Council expects to need to make further savings between now and 2019/20 as the resources available to run services continue to be reduced and because insufficient savings have been identified to date. This is resulting in

the Council using its reserves when setting the budget. This is not sustainable as reserves are only available on a once off basis.

- 16.2. The expected amount and timing of the savings for 2018/19 and future years has been detailed above. However, the definitive position is dependent on the Autumn Budget and Local Government Finance Settlement due in November and December respectively. For these reasons the work of the Lewisham Future Programme continues.

## 17. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

Short Title of Report	Date	Contact
Medium Term Financial Strategy <a href="http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s51446/Medium%20Term%20Financial%20Strategy.pdf">http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s51446/Medium%20Term%20Financial%20Strategy.pdf</a>	July 2017	David Austin
Budget 2017/18 <a href="http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s47966/2017%2018%20Budget%20Report.pdf">http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s47966/2017%2018%20Budget%20Report.pdf</a>	February 2017	David Austin

### Appendices

- i. B4 – Supporting People
- ii. D2 – Efficiency review proposal
- iii. E8 - Asset rationalisation proposal
- iv. I12 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Policy & Governance
- v. I13 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Finance
- vi. I14 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Counter Fraud
- vii. I15 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Accounting review
- viii. J3 - School effectiveness proposal
- ix. K5 – Crime problem solving
- x. M8 - Strategic housing proposal
- xi. O5 – Public services proposal
- xii. P3 – Planning income
- xiii. Corporate Savings Principles
- xiv. Making Fair Financial Decisions guidance
- xv. Summary of Equalities Implications
- xvi. Summary of savings proposals

For further information on this report, please contact:

David Austin, Head of Corporate Resources on 020 8314 9114

This page is intentionally left blank



**CONTENTS**

**Appendices**

- i.** B4 – Supporting People
- ii.** D2 – Efficiency review proposal
- iii.** E8 - Asset rationalisation proposal
- iv.** I12 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Policy & Governance
- v.** I13 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Finance
- vi.** I14 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Counter Fraud
- vii.** I15 - Management & corporate overhead proposal Accounting review
- viii.** J3 - School effectiveness proposal
- ix.** K5 – Crime problem solving
- x.** M8 - Strategic housing proposal
- xi.** O5 – Public services proposal
- xii.** P3 – Planning income

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix i

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Service economy rental income
Reference:	B4
LFP work strand:	Supporting People
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Protection and Safety
Service/Team area:	Supporting People
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing, and Older People
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Healthier / Safer Stronger Select Committees

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

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
The supporting people service funds housing related support via a number of providers to clients with varying needs. These range from high-support hostels to floating support in the community. To date savings proposals have been put forward totalling £5.5m since 2013.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
The service receives income from rental and the savings proposal is 50% if this income. The full amount is not proposed as this is required to support the services.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
The use of the income would support provision if not used for savings.
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
These are minimal and any resources allocated to this area are used directly for commissioning services .

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	6,549	(1,171)	5,378	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Service Economy	70	0	0	70
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
% of Net Budget	1%	%	%	1%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

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	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	9	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
negative	negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium	Medium	

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

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

9. Service equalities impact			
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	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
No specific 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
September 2017	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
October 2017	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C (despatch 24 October)
November 2016	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2017	Proposals to M&C for decision on 6 December (Despatch 29 Nov) and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2018	Transition work ongoing
February 2018	Transition work ongoing and budget set 21 February
March 2018	Savings implemented

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix ii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Corporate efficiency from unallocated inflation
Reference:	D2
LFP work strand:	Efficiency Review
Directorate:	Corporate
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Strategic Finance
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Corporate efficiency measure	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
This saving corporate and not related to any specific service area. It will be implemented through the annual budget process when agreed at Council in February 2018.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
The proposal is to not allocate £1m of the estimated £3.7m of inflation (£1.1m for pay and £2.6m for non-pay) to service budgets when setting the 2018/19 cash limits.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
The impact cannot be identified specifically as this is a general corporate saving. The impact will however be very limited as it represents a reduction of less than a half of one percent from all service budgets. Services will have to manage how best to absorb the reduction to their budget. For example; negotiate contract or agency rates, hold vacancies, limit discretionary spend during the year, etc..
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
The risk is that services will not contain their expenditure within their budget. This would be identified quickly through the financial monitoring and highlighted for action.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	232,700		232,700	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Corporate efficiency from unallocated inflation	1,000			1,000
Total	1,000			
% of Net Budget	0.5%	%	%	0.5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

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

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	2. Young people's achievement and involvement
Negative		3. Clean, green and liveable
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	4. Safety, security and a visible presence
Low		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. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

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:	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
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None – this saving, if agreed, will be taken as part of the Budget report to Council February 2018.

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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix iii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Income from Private Rented Scheme (PRS) Joint Venture
Reference:	E8
LFP work strand:	Asset Rationalisation
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Executive Director
Service/Team area:	Regeneration & Place
Cabinet portfolio:	Regeneration
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Generate rental income from PRS	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>R&amp;P and Strategic Housing are currently procuring a Joint Venture (JV) partner from the private sector. The Council will dispose of the Besson Street site into the JV, who will build, own and operate circa 230 Private Rental Sector (PRS) units. These units will comprise of at least 35% discounted London Living Rent units and provide a GP surgery at nil cost.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>Accounting for the procurement costs, financing costs, and management costs, the net annual rental revenues paid by the JV to the Council (in the form of an investment return) will generate circa £500k of new income for the Council over a period of not less than 30 years.</p> <p>The procurement is due to conclude and a report be presented to M&amp;C on the 6 December 2017. It is anticipated that the JV will form in March 2018, with the land transfer (and receipt) in 2018/19 after successful planning approval.</p> <p>Annual rental income will be generated from approximately 2021/22 onwards.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
<p>Positive impact on housing provision within the Borough, improved access to private rented accommodation. Increased Council Tax receipts. New, improved GP practice.</p> <p>Council staffing/management of JV needs to be considered and provided.</p>
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>



## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

Planning risk – JV appoints suitable architects and enters into a Pre-Planning Application to mitigate this

Financial risk – costs of build increase or rental levels decrease – JV competitively tenders build package and ensures that product produced can attract appropriate rental income

Partnership Risk – JV collapses – an extended public procurement exercise has been used with detailed HoTs agreed to ensure that the JV structure is robust and the most suitable partner appointed.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	16,870	(9,479)	7,391	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a)	500			500
Total	500			500
% of Net Budget	7%	%	%	7%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	Yes	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:			Transfer of site to GF will increase HRA headroom	

### 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
Impact on main	Impact on second	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	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
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
	Yes - New homes, community space and commercial space
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	New Cross

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
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>A M&amp;C report is scheduled for the 6 December with full legal implications, including the formation of a JV and the approval to enter into this for the purpose of funding and developing the Besson Street site.</p> <p>The last M&amp;C report was the 13 July 2016 and obtained approval to start the procurement of the JV partner.</p>

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:
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

<b>12. Summary timetable</b>	
<b>Month</b>	<b>Activity</b>
September 2017	Dialogue with bidders
October 2017	Final bids submitted
December 2017	M&C approval of JV partner
March 2018	Obtain SoS approval for disposal
March 2018	Enter JV, form new LLP
December 2018	Planning application made
March 2019	Land transfer to JV, land receipt received

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix iv

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Administrative budgets
Reference:	I12
LFP work strand:	Management & Corporate Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Policy and Governance
Service/Team area:	Executive Support
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Reduction of administrative budget	N	N	N

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p><b><u>Support to senior management and directorates</u></b></p> <p>This area of business provides support to senior management (Chief Executive, Executive Directors, Director and Heads of Service) and includes staffing and administrative costs. The function provides a wide range of administrative and clerical activities that support senior management in the planning and co-ordination of business within and across directorates. The function supports both internal (Mayor and Councillors) and external relations (with Government departments, partner agencies and the public). Significant reductions in staffing support have been delivered in recent years, culminating in the consolidation of most of these functions into a central location.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>A saving of £20k will be made from top slicing administrative budgets across the support activities to senior management.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
<p>Significant savings have already been made on the staffing support over recent years through rounds of staff cuts in this area of business. The consolidation of the remaining staffing support, largely to one floor, has exploited the scope for some efficiencies of co-location to mitigate the impact of such staff reductions and management of administrative costs.</p> <p>The focus now is on top slicing operational or administrative budgets but it does increase risks to meeting basic administrative needs. These risks are mitigated in part by excluding the key subscriptions budgets (the LGA and London Councils) from this saving and the beneficial impact of going increasingly “paperless” (reducing demand</p>

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

4. Impact and risks of proposal
for paper).
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
None noted

5. Financial information				
<b>Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)</b>	<b>Spend £'000</b>	<b>Income £'000</b>	<b>Net Budget £'000</b>	
	65	0	65	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>2018/19 £'000</b>	<b>2019/20 £'000</b>	<b>2020/21 £'000</b>	<b>Total £'000</b>
Reduce administrative budget	20			20
<b>Total</b>				
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>Does proposal impact on: Yes / No</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>DSG</b>	<b>HRA</b>	<b>Health</b>
	Yes	No	No	No
<b>If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:</b>				

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

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
<b>Main priority</b>	<b>Second priority</b>	<b>Corporate priorities</b>
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
<b>Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative</b>	<b>Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative</b>	
Neutral		
<b>Level of impact on main priority –</b>	<b>Level of impact on second priority –</b>	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High / Medium / Low	High / Medium / Low	9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
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	No
Workforce profile:	

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

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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented as part of 2018/19 budget

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix v

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Finance function efficiencies through the implementation of Oracle Cloud
Reference:	I13
LFP work strand:	I - Management and Corporate Overheads
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Financial Services
Service/Team area:	Financial Services Division
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Finance function service changes - £200k for 2018/19	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>The Financial Services division forms part of the Resources and Regeneration Directorate. It provides a range of different services which include; a statutory accounting function including core reconciliations, financial business and management accounting advice to managers, as well as a payroll and pensions administration function. Similar to the approach taken in recent years, it should also be noted that discussions about 'finance' also includes the strategic finance team, which is part of the Corporate Resources division. This team provides a budget strategy, treasury management and pensions' investment function.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>The Financial Services Division is expected a saving at £300k over the course of the next two years, £200k for 2018/19 and £100k for 2019/20. This target could only be achieved in the context of ensuring that the Council continues to meet its financial statutory obligations. This proposal provides focus on the identification and delivery of the £200k saving for 2018/19.</p> <p>In May 2017, Mayor &amp; Cabinet took a decision to integrate the IT functionality of the finance, procurement, human resources and payroll services through the development and implementation of an integrated Enterprise Resources Planning (ERP) solution. This programme, known as Oracle Cloud, is being designed to deliver a solution which will enable joined up information, processes and decision making. Amongst the most important element of business change, which financial services want to assist with, is encouraging business managers to take an enterprise view, by providing them with properly joined up information and a single entry point to initiate actions, rather than the separate ones for finance and human resources etc.,</p>

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

To deliver these savings it will be necessary to undertake an in-depth review of the Council's finance function in terms of how the staff teams are arranged and specific duties they are required to undertake. The aspiration is to move the function more towards an advisory type position, but it will take time to get there. This work is underway and it will be possible to deliver revenue budget savings of £200k for 2018/19.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The new solution is expected to engender greater self service for manages and budget holders throughout the organisation. Full adoption of the solution will be essential if the organisation is to fully realise the benefits and achieve the efficiencies needed.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Delivering savings of this order could have a significant impact on the council's ability to achieve its statutory obligations, the most fundamental one of which is to close the annual accounts and achieve a clean audit opinion at the end of that process. This will come about if officers are unable to fully realise the benefits of the new Oracle Cloud solution and ensure that it is used in the appropriate way.

Some of the function's routine responsibilities such as making statutory government returns (NNDR, Section 251, CTB, RA and RO forms etc.) would continue to be affected by reductions in the staffing compliment. Therefore, unless the finance function is deemed 'business ready' by April 2019 when the new Oracle Cloud solution is expected to have gone live, then there would be major risks of taking any more money out of the function. These risks are being mitigated through close monitoring of the Oracle Cloud design and delivery programme to ensure that any deviations from the plan can be appropriately rectified.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	4,682	(1,472)	3,210	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Finance function service changes	200			200
<b>Total</b>	200			200
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	6%	%	%	6%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No



## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

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
Digitisation	Sharing Services	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	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
Inspiring Efficiency, effectiveness and equity	N/A	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	N/A	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	N/A	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	None
	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:			

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

9. Service equalities impact	
None	
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					Possibly
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no specific legal implications which arise from agreeing this budget saving proposal. Any staffing changes, once identified, will be managed in compliance with the Council's managing change policy.

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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
September 2017	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
October 2017	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C (despatch 24 October)

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

<b>12. Summary timetable</b>	
November 2016	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2017	Proposals to M&C for decision on 6 December (Despatch 29 Nov) and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2018	Transition work ongoing
February 2018	Transition work ongoing and budget set 21 February
March 2018	Savings implemented

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix vi

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Loss of seconded Police Officer to Counter Fraud team
Reference:	I14
LFP work strand:	I – Management and Corporate Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Audit & Risk – Anti Fraud and Corruption Team (A-FACT)
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Loss of Police Officer secondment	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
The Anti-Fraud and Corruption Team (A-FACT) fulfils the statutory obligation on the Council to investigate Housing fraud. It also investigates, in accordance with legislation, allegations of misuses of public resources or internal fraud and promotes good practices to help protect public funds.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
Reduce the A-FACT budget by £70k to recognise the loss of the seconded police officer to Lewisham Council.
During 2017/18 the Metropolitan Police Service recalled all their Detective Constables, including the one seconded to Lewisham Council. They also confirmed that they would not be renewing this scheme that saw police officers seconded to London Boroughs and that in future this partnership working would return to being wholly between the authority and their local force.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
The loss of the Police Officer will mean that any criminal cases will have to be taken up by the local force rather than directly. In addition the Police Officer was the Council's Financial Investigator, able to pursue Proceeds of Crime cases. This access and skills are being lost.
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
The risks are the inability to pursue criminal cases or seek the recovery of assets without the support of the local police or other qualified investigators. The mitigations are to continue working closely with the Borough police force and look to train another

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

member of the team and a Financial Investigator or access these skills through the CIPFA Counter Fraud hub on an as needed basis.

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	330	(30)	300	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Loss of Police Officer seondment	70			70
<b>Total</b>	70			70
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	23%	%	%	23%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	Yes	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:			Some investigations concern housing matters	

### 6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
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		

### 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
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Negative		
Level of impact on main priority –	Level of impact on second priority –	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High / Medium / Low	High / Medium / Low	9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
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:	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	No
Workforce profile:	

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

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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix vii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Balance sheet review of accounting policies
Reference:	I15
LFP work strand:	Management and corporate overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Strategic Finance and Core Accounting
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Public Accounts Select Cttee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Review of MRP accounting policy	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
The service area facilitates the Council's Strategic Finance activities (managing the savings and budget setting process, providing corporate finance advice (including procurement), performing treasury management functions, and managing the pension fund) to support delivery of Council objectives.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
As part of the Treasury Management Strategy, review the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy and re-evaluate the appropriate levels required in line with current asset valuations to remain prudent and comply with international finance and CIPFA accounting guidance.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
This is a technical finance accounting adjustment that will not directly impact service users.
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
The risk is that if there is a sudden swing in the value of the Council's assets an in year charge would need to be taken to the Council's revenue budget. This will be mitigated by ensuring the asset position is considered with reference to the underlying value of the assets and any related borrowing costs to ensure a prudent approach.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	N/A		N/A – this concerns the balance sheet not revenue account	
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Review of MRP accounting policy	1,000			1,000
<b>Total</b>	1,000			1,000
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	%	%	%	%
<b>Does proposal impact on: Yes / No</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>DSG</b>	<b>HRA</b>	<b>Health</b>
	Yes	No	No	No
<b>If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:</b>				

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
N/A		A. Strengthening community input F. Sharing services G. Digitisation H. Income generating I. 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 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Med		

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific impact



## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

8. Ward impact	
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

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:	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	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
TBC – this will be part of setting the Council's Treasury Strategy as part of the budget in February 2018

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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
September 2017	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
October 2017	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C (despatch 24 October)
November 2016	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2017	Proposals to M&C for decision on 6 December (Despatch 29 Nov) and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2018	Transition work ongoing
February 2018	Transition work ongoing and budget set 21 February
March 2018	Savings implemented

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix viii

<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Statutory functions of School Effectiveness
<b>Reference:</b>	J3
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	School Effectiveness
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Young People
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Head of Standards and Inclusion
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Access, Inclusion and Participation
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Children and Young People
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Children and Young People

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes / No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes / No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes / No</b>
Statutory functions to be funded from DSG	No	No	No

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
The Attendance and Welfare service delivers services to ensure children and young people attend school and have appropriate access to education. This includes attendance and welfare, child employment and support for parents and schools on exclusions and the education of Looked After Children. Part of the service is traded with schools, the statutory functions have up to now been funded from the General Fund.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
The Department for Education removed the Education Services Grant (ESG) from Local Authorities in 2017/18. The grant was then treated as part of the General Fund. The Department for Education however moved the part of the grant that supported statutory education services to the Dedicated Schools Budget. It is now proposed that those former statutory services be funded out of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

<b>4. Impact and risks of proposal</b>
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
None
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
The former education services grant has been incorporated into the new central block of the Dedicated Services Grant, potentially this could be reduced by central government or a fall in pupil numbers which would put pressure on these services. Over the past few years the level of the Dedicated Services Grant has been cash frozen and this is likely to continue in the future, making the need for efficiencies to be made in the service.

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	366	0	366	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
Statutory functions to be funded from DSG	366			366
Total	366			366
% of Net Budget	100%	%	%	100%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	Yes		
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:		Costs transferred to the DSG		

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	B	
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
2	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	
Low	Low	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

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	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no specific 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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented when setting GF and DSG budgets for 2018/19

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix ix

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Problem solving crime reduction
Reference:	K5
LFP work strand:	Crime reduction
Directorate:	Community Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Protection and Safety
Service/Team area:	Crime, Enforcement and Regulation
Cabinet portfolio:	Community and Equalities
Scrutiny Committee(s):	Safer Stronger Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Problem solving crime reduction	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<p><b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b></p> <p>The <b>Crime, Enforcement and Regulation Service</b> covers the following statutory areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crime reduction service inc ASB, PREVENT</li> <li>• Statutory Nuisance</li> <li>• Licensing</li> <li>• Trading standards</li> </ul> <p>And the following non-statutory areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious Youth Violence</li> <li>• VAWG</li> <li>• Hate Crime</li> <li>• CCTV</li> <li>• Counter extremism</li> </ul> <p>The <b>CER service</b> was created in Aug 15. There has been significant investment in staff development and training to enable staff to deliver in this multi-faceted service. Areas such as <b>PREVENT, Serious Youth Violence, aspects of the VAWG service</b> etc are all externally funded.</p>
<p><b>Saving proposal</b></p> <p>The service has allocated funds to support problem solving processes which could require small amounts of resources to deliver and tackle problems identified throughout the year. The proposal is to reduce this budget and resource by 50%. The full amount is not proposed as this will significantly limit services being delivered directly to communities as problems are identified.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<p><b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b></p> <p>The impact based on previous years will be a limited flexibility to deliver and support</p>

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

problems that arise. This will impact on residents and partners.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Reduced service offer designed to tackle problems identified. The risks can not be mitigated as resources across the partnership are also reduced.

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	3,092	(1,233)	1,859	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
a) Problem solving crime reduction	30	0	0	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>1%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Y	N	N	N
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

### 6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

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

### 7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
4	1	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
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
negative	negative	
Level of impact on main priority –	Level of impact on second priority –	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High / Medium / Low	High / Medium / Low	9. Active, healthy citizens
Medium	Medium	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:	Low
Gender:	Medium	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Medium	Overall:	Medium
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
Workforce profile:	

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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix x

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation
Reference:	M8
LFP work strand:	Housing non-HRA
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Strategic Housing
Service/Team area:	Housing Needs and Refugee Services
Cabinet portfolio:	Housing
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Housing Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>The Housing Needs and Refugee Service manages the housing and homelessness assessment process, the statutory provision of emergency housing for homeless households, and the work that the Council is doing to support refugees.</p> <p>The London wide housing crisis has driven huge operational and financial pressures for all London local authorities in this area. In Lewisham there are now more than 1,800 households who are homeless and living in temporary accommodation, of whom more than 500 are living in “nightly paid” accommodation.</p> <p>Over the past five years the Council has pursued a wide ranging strategy to address these pressures. This has included: ambitious targets for Council house building; a range of projects to create better and cheaper forms of temporary accommodation of which PLACE/Ladywell has been the most high profile example; providing £40m of loan finance to Lewisham Homes to enable it to acquire properties for use for homeless households; and a focus on intervening with families earlier in the homelessness process in order to prevent rather than respond to potential problems.</p> <p>Through all of these measures, the number of households in nightly paid temporary accommodation has broadly stabilised at around 520, and there are on-going strategies in place to continue to reduce this number.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>The proposed saving is to reduce, by £250k, the budget of £3.05m which is held to fund “nightly paid” accommodation for homeless households.</p> <p>It is projected that this saving can be enabled in three ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By reducing the number of households placed in nightly paid accommodation</li> <li>2. By reducing the average cost per placement for households placed in nightly</li> </ol>



### 3. Description of service area and proposal

accommodation

3. By generating income from alternative forms of temporary accommodation that are being bought or built by the Council

The reduction in the overall number of households is projected to be achieved by continuing the range of interventions set out above. Further property acquisitions, conversions, leases and developments are expected to come forward in the coming year which will help to provide alternatives to nightly paid options. In addition the continuing focus on homelessness prevention should continue to tackle the overall level of demand.

The reduction in average cost per placement can be achieved through the effective targeting of the most expensive placements, supported by high quality management information and reporting on cases and costs that has been developed over the past two years. This approach has already helped to reduce average placement costs even as the number of placements has stayed the same.

Finally, some alternative forms of temporary accommodation generate an income to the Council, and in some cases also generate an operating surplus over and above the costs of operation and of financing the original investment. The PLACE/Ladywell and Hamilton Lodge developments are examples of where this has been possible, and have already facilitated revenue savings in previous iterations of the budget setting process. Officers are bringing forward further similar projects which will, in due course, also generate an operating surplus to the Council. While most of these are projected to come on-stream from 2018/19 onwards, it is still expected that a small additional operational surplus can be made in the coming year and can contribute to the overall £250k saving.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The Council and its service users are negatively impacted by the on-going housing crisis and the efforts set out above to address this by sourcing better and more sustainable accommodation benefit both homeless households and the Council's financial position.

In that sense, this proposal mainly provides benefits rather than risks. That said, there are risks to delivery. The London housing crisis could worsen, and increase demand more than currently expected. Equally the savings are predicated on the continuing tight management of placement costs, and continuing delivery of acquisition and new build projects, without which the saving will not be deliverable.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Tight operational management of costs can be facilitated through a structured approach to decision making and the provision of regular and robust management information to support decisions.

The delivery of acquisition and development projects can be supported by ensuring sufficient operational resources, processes and access to technical support is in place.

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	28,263	(22,675)	5,588	
HRA	n/a	n/a		
DSG	n/a	n/a		
Health	n/a	n/a		
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accomodation	250			250
Total	250			250
% of Net Budget	5%	%	%	5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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	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
Decent Homes for all	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	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

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:			
Nightly paid accommodation is least stable form of emergency accommodation. By providing alternatives to this form, residents will benefit from a positive impact			
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
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
There are no specific legal implications from reducing this budget. The specific proposals that have enabled it to be made, and future iterations of those, are all considered separately at Mayor and Cabinet and legal implications are considered at that time.

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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
April 2018	Budget reduced and savings implemented

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix xi

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Council Tax single person discount review
Reference:	O5
LFP work strand:	Public Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Head of Public Services
Service/Team area:	Revenues / Council Tax
Cabinet portfolio:	Resouces
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Ctte

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Council Tax single person discount review	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
Council Tax collection and administration.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>There are 125,000 households in the borough and of these 47,000 (37%) are in receipt of a single person discount. This is the highest percentage of single person discount claims in London.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed its single person discounts on an annual basis for many years using an external provider that carries out a data match exercise. This has generated additional Council Tax of over £700,000 pa. However, in 2017/18 the Council carried out a proof of concept using a more detailed data match, which identified a possible 2,500 incorrect claims and lost Council Tax of potentially up to £800,000 pa.</p> <p>The saving is the billing and collection of the additional Council Tax the review identified as due. The service believes it will collect at least £500K of this additional Council Tax in 2018/19.</p> <p>The reason the £500K is below the estimate of £800K, is because it is expected that further challenges to the discount withdrawal will be received once the Council sends a bill. In addition, the Council is expecting it is going to have to take a higher than normal level of enforcement action to collect the debt.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
The impact on service users will be that those Council Tax payers who are not entitled to a single person discount will have to pay more. There will be no impact on

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

partners. There will be some additional administration for staff.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that the data used is unreliable. However, Council Tax payers have been given two opportunities to challenge it before we withdrew the discount and sent an amended bill.

There is a risk that Council Tax payers may not pay the increased bill. However, the service will take enforcement action against those that do not pay their bill.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	
HRA	-			
DSG	-			
Health	-			
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
Council Tax single person discount review	500			
Total	500			
% of Net Budget	N/A	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

### 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		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High		

### 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
10		
Impact on main	Impact on second	

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive		5. Strengthening the local economy
		6. Decent homes for all
		7. Protection of children
		8. Caring for adults and the older people
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	9. Active, healthy citizens
Low		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:	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	No
Workforce profile:	

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

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:	
The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
March 2018	Savings implemented

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### Appendix xii

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Planning savings
Reference:	P3
LFP work strand:	Planning and economic development
Directorate:	Resources and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Head of Planning
Service/Team area:	Planning
Cabinet portfolio:	Regeneration
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

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

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>The Government has recently laid before Parliament draft legislation relating to changes to the Planning Statutory Fees. It is proposed that planning application fees will be increased by 20%, which should be in place by 1 April 2018.</p> <p>Planning Application Fees for 2016/17 were £910,778 and are forecasted as £1.2m during 2017/18, against an annual budget of £929,000 for both years. An increase of 20% would have uplifted this income to £1,092,934, an increase of £182k (2016/17) and £1,440,000 a forecast increase of £240k (2017/18).</p> <p>However, we are only able to take advantage of the 20% increase in fees if we do not reduce our base budget. This Government requirement has been introduced to ensure that the application fee increase will be “ring-fenced” to improve planning capacity and customer service. Therefore, the Development Management (E44613) base budget of £1,751,393 cannot be reduced in the budget savings exercise for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>The Planning Service have therefore looked to identify opportunities to generate additional income as opposed to savings to the base budget.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>In total £270k made up of:</p> <p>£240k from the outline proposal for 2018/19 presented in the savings round for 2017/18. This was anticipated to come from £200k income and £40k restructure. Due to the ringfencing of the base budget, the £40k restructure figure is no longer achievable via a restructure but would be more than offset by the statutory fee increase.</p> <p>The additional £30k increase in income to the DM budget will come through a further</p>

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

review of and increase to chargeable services.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

There will be an impact on service users through the increase of fees. However, these have not been reviewed for some time and we would be seeking to ensure that we are fully recovering the cost. The Planning Service are continuing to improve the Planning web pages to ensure that a free offer is available to any householders looking to undertake works in the Borough. Discussions with developers has indicated a willingness to pay increased fees if it enables a good level of service to be provided.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

There is a risk that by increasing fees, less customers will choose to use the service. In order to minimise this, the Planning Service are already looking at customer satisfaction and ways of promoting and marketing services.

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	2,637	(1,582)	1,055	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Saving proposed:	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	Total £'000
income	270			270
Total	270			270
% of Net Budget	26%	5%	%	26%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

### 6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

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

### 7. Impact on Corporate priorities

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



## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

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

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	No
Workforce profile:	

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
As increasing income to cover the full cost of undertaking service, no 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:

## Savings Proposals Appendices i to ix – October 2017

### 12. Summary timetable

The main savings timetable for 2018/19 has been included here FYI. Please amend for proposal if different.

Month	Activity
September 2017	Proposals prepared
October 2017	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C (despatch 24 October)
November 2016	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2017	Proposals to M&C for decision on 6 December (Despatch 29 Nov) and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2018	Transition work ongoing
February 2018	Transition work ongoing and budget set 21 February
March 2018	Savings implemented

## **APPENDICES xiii to xvi**

### **Contents**

Appendix xiii Corporate Savings Principles

Appendix xiv Making Fair Financial Decisions Guidance

Appendix xv Summary of equality implications

Appendix xvi Savings Summary Table

## Appendix xiii

### 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 short term 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 xiv**



**Making fair financial decisions  
Guidance for decision-makers**

3<sup>rd</sup> edition, January 2015

## **Introduction**

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 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 people with different protected characteristics.

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.

## **What 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 characteristics 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 1998. We would therefore recommend that public authorities consider the potential impact their decisions could have on human rights.

## Aim 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 people with protected characteristics 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 at [www.equalityhumanrights.com](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com)

## The 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 with protected characteristics.

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 characteristics.** Individual decisions should also be informed by the wider context of decisions in your own and other relevant public authorities, so that people with particular protected characteristics 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.



## **When should your assessments be carried out?**

Assessments of the impact on equality must be carried out at a **formative stage** so that the assessment is an integral part of the development of a proposed policy, not a later justification of a policy that has already been adopted. Financial proposals which are relevant to equality, such as those likely to impact on equality in your workforce and/or for your community, should always be subject to a thorough assessment. This includes proposals to outsource or procure any of the functions of your organisation. The assessment should form part of the proposal, and you should consider it carefully **before** making your decision.

If you are presented with a proposal that has not been assessed for its impact on equality, you should question whether this enables you to consider fully the proposed changes and its likely impact. Decisions not to assess the impact on equality should be fully documented, along with the reasons and the evidence used to come to this conclusion. This is important as authorities may need to rely on this documentation if the decision is challenged.

It is also important to remember that the potential impact is not just about numbers. Evidence of a serious impact on a small number of individuals is just as important as something that will impact on many people.

## **What should I be looking for in my assessments?**

Assessments of impact on equality need to be based on relevant information and enable the decision-maker to understand the equality implications of a decision and any alternative options or proposals.

As with everything, proportionality is a key principle. Assessing the impact on equality of a major financial proposal is likely to need significantly more effort and resources dedicated to ensuring effective engagement, than a simple assessment of a proposal to save money by changing staff travel arrangements.

There is no prescribed format for assessing the impact on equality, but the following questions and answers provide guidance to assist you in determining whether you consider that an assessment is robust enough to rely on:

- **Is the purpose of the financial proposal clearly set out?**

A robust assessment will set out the reasons for the change; how this change can impact on protected groups, as well as whom it is intended to benefit; and the intended outcome. You should also think about how individual financial proposals might relate to one another. This is because a series of changes to different policies or services could have a severe impact on particular protected characteristics.

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 characteristics. 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 characteristics 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.

**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. Legal cases have shown what can happen when authorities do not consider their equality duties when making decisions.

**Example:** A court 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 people with particular protected characteristics and perpetuate or worsen inequality.

As part of its regulatory role to ensure compliance with the equality duty, the Commission monitors financial decisions with a view to ensuring that these are taken in compliance with the equality duty and have taken into account the need to mitigate negative impacts, where possible.

## **Appendix xv**

### **Summary of Equalities Implications**

Please see section 15.22 of the main report.

APPENDIX xvi

**2018/19 SAVINGS - SUMMARY TABLE OF NEW PROPOSALS WITH PROFORMA AT NOVEMBER 2017**

Ref.	Description	18/19 £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
<b>B</b>	<b>Supporting People</b>				
B4	Service economy rental income	70	N	N	N
<b>D</b>	<b>Efficiency Review</b>				
D2	Reduction in allocated Inflation	1,000	Y	N	N
<b>E</b>	<b>Asset Rationalisation</b>				
E8	Income from PRS joint venture - Besson St.	500	Y	N	N
<b>I</b>	<b>Management and Corporate Overheads</b>				
I12	Administration budget cut	20	N	N	N
I13	More efficient & effective finance processes	200	N	N	Y
I14	Loss of the Police Officer secondment	70	N	N	N
I15	Review of accounting policies in respect of the balance sheet	1,000	Y	N	N
<b>J</b>	<b>School Effectiveness</b>				
J3	Statutory functions for school effectiveness	360	N	N	N
<b>K</b>	<b>Crime reduction</b>				
K5	Crime problem solving	30	N	N	N
<b>M</b>	<b>Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services</b>				
M8	Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation	250	N	N	N
<b>O</b>	<b>Public Services</b>				
O5	Council tax single person discount review	500	N	N	N
<b>P</b>	<b>Planning and economic development</b>				
P	Service income	270	N	N	N
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>4,270</b>			
	Previously Agreed (A19, L8 and Q 6 & 7)	580			
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,850</b>			

Ref.	Description	18/19 £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Select Ctte	Comment
<b>B</b>	<b>Supporting People</b>						
B4	Service economy rental income	70	N	N	N	Healthier	
<b>D</b>	<b>Efficiency Review</b>						
D2	Reduction in allocated Inflation	1,000	Y	N	N	Public Accounts	
<b>E</b>	<b>Asset Rationalisation</b>						
E8	Income from PRS joint venture - Besson St.	500	Y	N	N	Public Accounts	
<b>I</b>	<b>Management and Corporate Overheads</b>						
I12	Administration budget cut	20	N	N	N	Public Accounts	
I13	More efficient & effective finance processes	200	N	N	Y	Public Accounts	
I14	Loss of the Police Officer secondment	70	N	N	N	Public Accounts	
I15	Review of accounting policies in respect of the balance sheet	1,000	Y	N	N	Public Accounts	
<b>J</b>	<b>School Effectiveness</b>						
J3	Statutory functions for school effectiveness	360	N	N	N	Children and Young People (CYP)	
<b>K</b>	<b>Crime reduction</b>						
K5	Crime problem solving	30	N	N	N	Safer Stronger	
<b>M</b>	<b>Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services</b>						

Ref.	Description	18/19 £'000	Key Decision	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation	Select Ctte	Comment
M8	Reduced costs of providing nightly paid accommodation	250	N	N	N	Housing	
<b>O</b>	<b>Public Services</b>						
O5	Council tax single person discount review	500	N	N	N	Public Accounts	
<b>P</b>	<b>Planning and economic development</b>						
P	Service income	270	N	N	N	Sustainable Development	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>4,270</b>					
	Previously Agreed: A19; L8; and Q 6f & 7a.	300 130 50				Healthier Safer Stronger CYP	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,850</b>					