

Overview and Scrutiny



Sustainable Development Select Committee Supplementary Agenda

Thursday, 14 January 2021

7.00 pm, Remote - on Microsoft Teams - the public are welcome to observe via the Council's website at <https://lewisham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

For more information contact: Timothy Andrew (timothy.andrew@lewisham.gov.uk)

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

Part 1

Item		Pages
6.	Budget cuts (appendix 9)	3 - 10

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND EQUALITIES ANALYSIS – BUDGET CUT PROPOSALS 2021/22

INTRODUCTION

This report is in two parts and summarises the anticipated impact of 2021/22 budget cut proposals on characteristics protected under the Equality Act 2010 and anticipated impact of the proposals on the corporate strategy priorities. In addition, the report highlights the anticipated impact of budget cut proposals on wards.

It is in two parts; the first presenting the analysis for the 41 round 2 proposals in this report and the second presenting the analysis combining that for the 54 round 1 (presented to M&C in December) amended for those decisions and the 41 round 2 proposals (total proposals 95).


The proposals and analysis cover the next three years 2021/22 to 2023/24. The 95 proposals totalling £41.7m of cuts over the three years, with £28m for 2021/22.

ROUND 2 ANALYSIS

Impact of budget cut proposals on protected characteristics

Table A below shows the anticipated impact of cuts proposals on protected characteristics. Specifically the table shows that the protected characteristics of ethnicity, gender, age, disability, pregnancy / maternity, and sexual orientation with 'high' impact proposals against them. Of these ethnicity and gender were identified in the most, age and disability second, and pregnancy / maternity and sexual orientation the least.

The balance of proposals which are anticipated to have a 'medium' impact in spread more evenly across the proposal but by more proposals for ethnicity and disability. Notable, consistent with previous cuts proposals, are the high number of proposals with limited or no impact on protected characteristics. This reflects that many of the changes are to operational practices to ensure good governance and operation effectiveness (see impact on corporate priorities below).



Appendix 9



Tables B1 and B2 below shows the overall (cumulative) impact of the cuts proposals by number and value. This is based on the assessment of high, medium, and low judgements across the various protected characteristics overall.

By number, of the 41 proposals 9 (22%) are anticipated to have a high or medium impact compared to 26 (63%) having a low or no (not applicable) impact.

By value, of the 41 proposals the 9 identified with high or medium impact are for £6,984k (46%) compared to £7,076k (47%) for the 26 having a low or no impact.


The four proposals with an anticipated high impact overall are:

- B11 £1,000k – Improved usage of the Better Care Funding across partners
- C13 £100k – Sexual and reproductive health services in primary care
- C15 £150k – Integrated sexual reproductive health services
- F24 £4,279k – Adult social care cost reduction and service improvement



Appendix 9


Table C below shows the number of budget proposals where a full Equality Analysis Assessment (EAA) is required. Specifically it shows that 11 proposals with a value of £6,882k will require a full EAA to be completed prior to a final decision being made and the cut implemented in full.



Geographical impact of budget cut proposals

Table D below shows that for the majority 32 (78%) there is no specific ward impact (i.e. the changes will impact services across the Borough as a whole).

The table shows there are 4 proposals with specific ward(s) impact. They are C26, F20, F21, and F22. C26 impacts local leisure facilities and the F proposals impact parking charges so localised according to the arrangement in place by ward.



Impact on corporate strategy priorities

The information in the Tables E below show the number and value of the cuts impact by corporate strategy priority.



Appendix 9

By number, the three corporate priorities identified as likely to be the most impacted (all of first, second, and third choices) are:

- Giving Children and Young People the best start in life
- Good governance and operational effectiveness (not a formal priority in the corporate strategy but added to capture proposals to operational practice)
- Delivering and defending Health and Social Care.

This impact on priorities is also carried through into the analysis by value of the cuts to the corporate strategy. Looking at the first choice (main priority) impact the number and value of cuts by the three most impacted priorities are:

- Giving Children and Young People the best start in life – 13 cuts for £3,199k
- Good governance and operational effectiveness – 6 cuts for £2,705k
- Delivering and defending Health and Social Care – 9 cuts for £6,199k




COMBINED ROUND 1 (POST M&C) AND ROUND 2 (PRE M&C) ANALYSIS

Impact of budget cut proposals on protected characteristics

Table A below shows the anticipated impact of cuts proposals on protected characteristics. Specifically the table shows that the protected characteristics of ethnicity, gender, age, disability, pregnancy / maternity, and sexual orientation with 'high' impact proposals against them. Of these gender and age were identified in the most, ethnicity and disability second, and pregnancy / maternity and sexual orientation the least.

The balance of proposals which are anticipated to have a 'medium' impact in spread more evenly across the proposal but by more proposals for disability. Notable, consistent with previous cuts proposals, are the high number of proposals with limited or no impact on protected characteristics. This reflects that many of the changes are to operational practices to ensure good governance and operation effectiveness (see impact on corporate priorities below).



Tables B1 and B2 below shows the overall (cumulative) impact of the cuts proposals by number and value. This is based on the assessment of high, medium, and low judgements across the various protected characteristics overall.

By number, of the 95 proposals 15 (16%) are anticipated to have a high or medium impact compared to 69 (73%) having a low or no (not applicable) impact.

By value, of the 95 proposals the 15 identified with high or medium impact are for £8,516k (20%) compared to £27,611k (66%) for the 69 having a low or no impact.

The seven proposals with an anticipated high impact overall are:

- C02 £150k – Adult learning and day opportunities
- E04 £82k – Introducing charging for certain elements of self-funded care
- F09 £600k – In-house reductions – adult passenger transport
- B11 £1,000k – Improved usage of the Better Care Funding across partners

Appendix 9

- C13 £100k – Sexual and reproductive health services in primary care
- C15 £150k – Integrated sexual reproductive health services
- F24 £4,279k – Adult social care cost reduction and service improvement







Table C below shows the number of budget proposals where a full Equality Analysis Assessment (EAA) is required. Specifically it shows that 21 proposals with a value of £11,080k will require a full EAA to be completed prior to a final decision being made and the cut implemented in full.



Geographical impact of budget cut proposals

Table D below shows that for the majority 32 (78%) there is no specific ward impact (i.e. the changes will impact services across the Borough as a whole).

The table shows there are 4 proposals with specific ward(s) impact. They are C26, F20, F21, and F22. C26 impacts local leisure facilities and the F proposals impact parking charges so localised according to the arrangement in place by ward.



Impact on corporate strategy priorities

The information in the Tables E1 & E2 below show the number and value of the cuts impact by corporate strategy priority.

By number, the three corporate priorities identified as likely to be the most impacted (all of first, second, and third choices) are:

- Giving Children and Young People the best start in life
- Good governance and operational effectiveness (not a formal priority in the corporate strategy but added to capture proposals to operational practice)
- Delivering and defending Health and Social Care.

This impact on priorities is also carried through into the analysis by value of the cuts to the corporate strategy. Looking at the first choice (main priority) impact the number and value of cuts by the three most impacted priorities are:

- Giving Children and Young People the best start in life – 22 cuts for £6,654k
- Good governance and operational effectiveness – 24 cuts for £14,136k
- Delivering and defending Health and Social Care – 18 cuts for £13,862k

For the most significant two service priorities identified - Children, Health and Social Care - to put this into context the Council's overall net general fund budget has 70%

Appendix 9

of the budget for adult and children social care and public health. The cuts identified to these priorities for Children, Health and Social Care (although they are not the only ones impacting these services and other will be under good governance for example) represent £20.5m (49%) of the total £41.6m of proposals.

