

Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee Agenda

Monday, 3 November 2014

7.00 pm,

Committee room 2

Civic Suite

Lewisham Town Hall

London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Timothy Andrew (02083147916)

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

Part 1

| Item | Pages |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2014 | 1 - 6 |
| 2. Declarations of interest | 7 - 10 |
| 3. Lewisham Future Programme | 11 - 290 |
| 4. Main grant programme funding To follow | |
| 5. Select Committee work programme | 291 - 322 |
| 6. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet | |

Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee Members

Members of the committee, listed below, are summoned to attend the meeting to be held on Monday, 3 November 2014.

Barry Quirk, Chief Executive
Thursday, 23 October 2014

| | |
|--|--|
| Councillor Pauline Morrison (Chair) | |
| Councillor David Michael (Vice-Chair) | |
| Councillor Andre Bourne | |
| Councillor Colin Elliott | |
| Councillor Alicia Kennedy | |
| Councillor Pat Raven | |
| Councillor Luke Sorba | |
| Councillor Eva Stamirowski | |
| Councillor Paul Upex | |
| Councillor James-J Walsh | |
| Councillor Alan Hall (ex-Officio) | |
| Councillor Gareth Siddorn (ex-Officio) | |

MINUTES OF THE SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 10 September 2014 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Pauline Morrison (Chair), David Michael (Vice-Chair), Andre Bourne, Colin Elliott, Alicia Kennedy, Pat Raven, Luke Sorba, Eva Stamirowski, Paul Upex and James-J Walsh

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Roy Kennedy, Ian Alderson (MPS Lewisham), Timothy Andrew (Scrutiny Manager), Gary Connors (Strategic Community Safety Services Manager), Barrie Neal (Head of Corporate Policy and Governance), Adeolu Solarin (VAWG Co-ordinator) and Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People)

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2014

In response to a request from the Committee, Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People) provided an update on the actions agreed at the last meeting. It was reported that:

- following discussions with the facilitators of the responsible retailers and City Safe Havens schemes - it was recommended that, rather than attempting to recruit businesses directly, Councillors who wanted to support these schemes could put businesses in contact with organisers.

Resolved: that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 July be agreed as an accurate record.

2. Declarations of interest

Councillor David Michael declared a non-prejudicial interest in relation to items three and four as a member of Lewisham's safer neighbourhood board.

3. Safer Lewisham Plan update

Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People) introduced the report; the following key points were noted:

- Over the previous year, there had been significant reductions in the majority of major crime types with the exception of violence with injury.
- One particular areas of success had been the reduction of residential burglaries.
- The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) in Lewisham had piloted a system of 'predictive policing'.
- The Lewisham MPS had examined burglary figures over ten years and mapped out the likelihood of crimes occurring in different areas of the borough. Resources were then focused on affected areas.
- This work resulted in a decrease in residential burglary.

- The increase in the figures for violence with injury should be viewed in the context of changes to the definition of this category.
- Some forms of violence, which weren't previously recorded under the category of violence with injury, such as actual bodily harm, were now being recorded in this category.
- Tackling violence against women and girls had been a priority in Lewisham for most of the previous decade.
- There had been a recent increase in recorded instances of domestic violence, which had to be viewed in the context of an overall decline in domestic violence in the past six years.
- It was also important to note that increases in reports of some crime types were the result of targeted police activity or confidence on the part of victims to come forward.
- New legislation was coming into force which would place a statutory duty on the Council to respond to repeated reports of anti-social behaviour.
- The new duties included the 'community trigger', which would come into effect in early 2015. The measure had been put in place following high profile instances, nationally, of multi-agency failure to respond to repeated reports of anti-social behaviour.
- The 'community trigger' for anti-social behaviour would be activated if three instances of anti-social behaviour were reported to the council (or partner organisations) and not dealt with satisfactorily.
- The trigger would also be activated if five different people complained about an issue (without resolution) in a six month period.
- The Council would be required to publish its standards for the trigger, setting out appropriate forms of resolution. These would be agreed by the Safer Lewisham Partnership – and made available to the Committee for scrutiny in due course.
- Once the trigger had been activated, the Council would be required to hold a multi-agency conference within 10 days to provide a response to the complainant(s).
- Officers had been working with other London Boroughs to ensure that there was a joined up approach to the new legislation.
- Lewisham had a good history of tackling anti-social behaviour. The Safer Lewisham Partnership had a consistent victim centred approach. The anti-social behaviour multi agency risk assessment conference process was also widely recognised to be good practice.

Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People), Gary Connors (Crime Reduction Manager), Ade Solarin (Violence Against Women and Girls Coordinator) and Ian Alderson (MPS Lewisham) answered questions from the Committee; the following key points were noted:

- Reports made through the website would be monitored for repeated incidences of ASB in the same area.
- In effect, Councillors already exercised a community trigger by reporting casework so it wasn't anticipated that Councillors would make extensive use of the new system. Officers would continue to work closely with Councillors to ensure that issues were identified and dealt with.
- Data about ASB could be broken down in a number of ways and could be reported with the next safer Lewisham plan update to the Committee.

- There hadn't been any specific analysis or evaluation of the use of predictive policing to demonstrate its effectiveness. Predictive policing was only one part of the approach taken by the MPS in Lewisham to reduce crime – in the case of residential burglary, there had been a concerted efforts in offender management, prevention, information and evidence gathering to prevent and reduce incidences of burglary.
- Amongst the types of anti-social behaviour reported in the borough, dog fouling was not high up on the list of priorities for action.
- There had been work in the past to deal with people who allowed their dogs to foul in public places, including the issuing of fixed penalty notices by street wardens and CCTV in parks, as well as education, dog micro-chipping and awareness raising. These approaches had some success.
- Reports of hate crime in Lewisham were below the London average. Work had been carried out to enable reporting through third party sites (including libraries).
- Whilst it was recognised there was underreporting, there were no specific measures with which to calculate how many hate crimes should be reported in the borough.

The Committee also discussed the following key points:

- The level of nuisance and anxiety created by dog fouling in different areas of the borough.
- The difficulty of tackling some people's poor attitudes to public places; including the small groups of people who thought it was acceptable to swear around children, spit, drop litter or allow their dogs to foul public places.

Resolved: to receive a further update on the SLP plan at the Committee's meeting in March; to include a breakdown of locations (by ward) and types of anti-social behaviour; as well as figures detailing a broader range of crime types and additional information about the implementation of the community trigger.

4. Violence against women and girls

Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People) introduced the report; the following key points were noted:

- Lewisham previously had the highest reported levels of domestic violence in the country.
- The Safer Lewisham Partnership had made the reduction of domestic violence a priority and had focused resources on a range of initiatives, including; a specialist domestic violence court, individual domestic violence advocates, multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARAC), victim support and refuges.
- In response to the broader context of inequality and violence facing women and girls; the government and the Mayor of London had developed violence against women and girls (VAWG) strategies which included plans to eliminate:
 - Domestic violence
 - Rape and sexual violence

- Prostitution and trafficking
 - Sexual exploitation
 - Female genital mutilation (FGM)
 - Forced marriage
 - Honor based violence
 - Stalking and harassment
- In Lewisham, it was recognised that there was good information and data about domestic violence but there was a lack of information in the majority of the other areas.
 - Lewisham had piloted the Multi Agency Sexual Exploitation (MASE) conference to improve coordination between agencies. The learning from this pilot had now been adopted by all London boroughs.
 - Lewisham had also commissioned Imkaan (an organisation committed to tackling violence against women and girls) to review the borough's violence against women and girls strategy and make recommendations for improvements.
 - As a result of the consultation, a new combined service was being created to develop a single approach to tackling VAWG in the borough.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following key points were noted:

- A tendering process for the new service was underway. The new combined service would start in April next year.
- No decision had been taken about the location of the new service. There were no particular domestic violence hot spots in the borough. Crimes were distributed across Lewisham.
- The new service would be required to find its own premises; however there would be an expectation that it would have a presence at Lewisham Police station – which was a considerable source of referrals.
- The service would support all victims, including boys and men.
- There had been 49 responses to the consultation on the violence against women and girls strategy. There was concern that this number was low. However, it should be noted that there were only 69 responses to the Mayor of London's violence against women and girls strategy consultation, so in comparison the response to the Lewisham consultation was good.
- The review highlighted some gaps in the provision of support services in Lewisham. Of particular concern was the experience some victims identified of approaching agencies for support and not being believed.
- It was proposed that the new organisation would develop an approach to prevention and awareness raising - as well as initiatives to encourage healthy relationships.
- There had been five reviews into domestic homicides in the previous two and a half years, which highlighted a number of issues but also enabled Lewisham to consider the combined dangers of poor mental health, substance misuse and violence.
- There was no straightforward definition of what constituted a gang.
- There had been a shift in Lewisham from street gangs of school age children (who fought over territory and status) to looser groupings of young adults that operated as 'criminal cliques'.

- The primary focus of these groups was to run unregulated drug businesses. They used violence to support their businesses as part of their association with wider criminal networks.
- Much of the violence against gang associated girls was hidden.
- Support for gang associated girls was not a separate strand of the VAWG agenda.
- Anecdotally it seemed that there had been an increase in the numbers of women associated with gangs as perpetrators.
- The new VAWG service would focus on three priorities – domestic violence, sexual abuse and rape as well as child sexual exploitation.
- Dealing with gang related sexual violence would not be part of the contract for the new service, but the service would work to support people who were experiencing issues in any of the strand areas.
- The challenge for the police was dealing with the changing nature of criminal activity – some of the young people found to be involved in drug running for criminal groups were unknown to any agency and had no previous contact with police, meaning that their involvement was hidden.
- A range of early intervention, awareness raising and prevention work had been carried out in the borough. There was no single programme. Lewisham had worked with the police service to pilot the ‘Heart’ project, which focused on developing healthy relationships. Officers continued to build on this work.
- The DV MARAC in Lewisham enabled a comprehensive package of support to be put in place for victims and their families.
- It was recognised that suffering abuse or witnessing violence at an early age was damaging to development.
- Work had been carried out with the nurse family partnership to support vulnerable parents and children.
- Officers in the Children and Young People directorate had responsibility for looked after children. Lewisham and its partners worked well together to ensure that there were good routes into services for young people at risk.
- Training with foster carers also took place to prevent placements breaking down.
- It was important to remember that young people in care were not ‘trouble makers’. There was an unhelpful tendency for people to think that all looked after young people were problematic, which was not the case.
- Lewisham offered a menu of training and support options for schools to take up. Each school that wanted support had a bespoke offer.
- There was variability in the take up of support in schools. Schools were being asked to manage intervention programmes and risks from a range of different sources. It would be useful to determine what might constitute a good offer to schools and what might be seen as a reasonable level of uptake.
- Parents teachers and pupils were all targets of work in schools.
- The Council was supporting a new peer advocacy project ‘Parents Standing Together’ lead by the parents of victims to support other parents and young people, which it was hoped, would be an effective way to spread the message.
- The Council and its partners were working with faith and community groups locally to challenge perceptions and build on the ambitions of the VAWG plan.

- It was recognised that there was some hidden violence committed by older children against their parents, which was an increasing problem as older children moved back in with their parents because of the lack of affordable housing.

Resolved: to note the report and to receive additional information about familial abuse.

5. Select Committee work programme

Timothy Andrew (Scrutiny Manager) introduced the report. The Committee then discussed the work programme.

Resolved: to receive a scoping paper for a review into violence against women and girls.

6. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet

The meeting ended at 9.05 pm

Chair:

Date:

| Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| Title | Declaration of interests | | |
| Contributor | Chief Executive | Item | 2 |
| Class | Part 1 (Open) | 03 November 2014 | |

Declaration of interests

Members are asked to declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda.

1. Personal interests

There are three types of personal interest referred to in the Council's Member Code of Conduct:

- (1) Disclosable pecuniary interests
- (2) Other registerable interests
- (3) Non-registerable interests

2. Disclosable pecuniary interests are defined by regulation as:-

- (a) Employment, trade, profession or vocation of a relevant person* for profit or gain
- (b) Sponsorship – payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than by the Council) within the 12 months prior to giving notice for inclusion in the register in respect of expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member or towards your election expenses (including payment or financial benefit from a Trade Union).
- (c) Undischarged contracts between a relevant person* (or a firm in which they are a partner or a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest) and the Council for goods, services or works.
- (d) Beneficial interests in land in the borough.
- (e) Licence to occupy land in the borough for one month or more.
- (f) Corporate tenancies – any tenancy, where to the member's knowledge, the Council is landlord and the tenant is a firm in which the relevant person* is a partner, a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest.
- (g) Beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
 - (a) that body to the member's knowledge has a place of business or land in the borough;

(b) and either

- (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that body; or
- (ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person* has a beneficial interest exceeds 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that class.

*A relevant person is the member, their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they live as spouse or civil partner.

3. Other registerable interests

The Lewisham Member Code of Conduct requires members also to register the following interests:-

- (a) Membership or position of control or management in a body to which you were appointed or nominated by the Council
- (b) Any body exercising functions of a public nature or directed to charitable purposes, or whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy, including any political party
- (c) Any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25

4. Non registerable interests

Occasions may arise when a matter under consideration would or would be likely to affect the wellbeing of a member, their family, friend or close associate more than it would affect the wellbeing of those in the local area generally, but which is not required to be registered in the Register of Members' Interests (for example a matter concerning the closure of a school at which a Member's child attends).

5. Declaration and Impact of interest on members' participation

- (a) Where a member has any registerable interest in a matter and they are present at a meeting at which that matter is to be discussed, they must declare the nature of the interest at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered. The declaration will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. If the matter is a disclosable pecuniary interest the member must take no part in consideration of the matter and withdraw from the room before it is considered. They must not seek improperly to influence the decision in any way. **Failure to declare such an interest which has not already been entered in the Register of Members' Interests, or participation where such an interest exists, is liable to prosecution and on conviction carries a fine of up to £5000**
- (b) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest they must still declare the nature of the interest to the meeting at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered, but they may stay in the room, participate in

consideration of the matter and vote on it unless paragraph (c) below applies.

- (c) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest, the member must consider whether a reasonable member of the public in possession of the facts would think that their interest is so significant that it would be likely to impair the member's judgement of the public interest. If so, the member must withdraw and take no part in consideration of the matter nor seek to influence the outcome improperly.
- (d) If a non-registerable interest arises which affects the wellbeing of a member, their, family, friend or close associate more than it would affect those in the local area generally, then the provisions relating to the declarations of interest and withdrawal apply as if it were a registerable interest.
- (e) Decisions relating to declarations of interests are for the member's personal judgement, though in cases of doubt they may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer.

6. Sensitive information

There are special provisions relating to sensitive interests. These are interests the disclosure of which would be likely to expose the member to risk of violence or intimidation where the Monitoring Officer has agreed that such interest need not be registered. Members with such an interest are referred to the Code and advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance.

7. Exempt categories

There are exemptions to these provisions allowing members to participate in decisions notwithstanding interests that would otherwise prevent them doing so. These include:-

- (a) Housing – holding a tenancy or lease with the Council unless the matter relates to your particular tenancy or lease; (subject to arrears exception)
- (b) School meals, school transport and travelling expenses; if you are a parent or guardian of a child in full time education, or a school governor unless the matter relates particularly to the school your child attends or of which you are a governor;
- (c) Statutory sick pay; if you are in receipt
- (d) Allowances, payment or indemnity for members
- (e) Ceremonial honours for members
- (f) Setting Council Tax or precept (subject to arrears exception)

This page is intentionally left blank

| SCRUTINY COMMITTEES | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Report Title | Lewisham Future Programme 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings Report | | |
| Key Decision | No | Item No. | |
| Ward | All Wards | | |
| Contributors | Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration | | |
| Class | Part 1 | Date: | Oct. & Nov. 2014 |

REASONS FOR LATENESS AND URGENCY

This report was not available for the original dispatch because of the need to compile detailed information from a number of different Council departments. The report is urgent cannot wait until the next meeting because delaying the scrutiny and decision making process and failing to achieve savings as scheduled could create additional future budgetary pressures.

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. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report updates members on the work of the Lewisham future programme and puts forward £40.6m of new savings proposals developed by officers over the last nine months for member scrutiny and informal consultations.
- 1.2. The Council is now in the fourth year of an eight year long period of resource reduction. Over the period 2010 to 2014 the Council made savings of over £100m. The Council developed principles by which savings were made during the period 2010 to 2014 and these same principles for savings apply for those being brought forward in respect of the period 2015 to 2018. This level of continual reduction means that proposals need to be increasingly transformational and are becoming increasingly difficult to identify and implement.
- 1.3. This report continues the work of the Lewisham future programme work to progress the transformational changes necessary to enable the Council to seize the opportunities of growth in London and reposition itself strongly for the future, while at the same time living within the financial resources at its disposal. This challenge and the work of the Lewisham future programme are set out in sections 5 & 6.
- 1.4. The Council faces an £85m budget gap over the three years to 2017/18 with an estimated £39m gap for 2015/16. The immediate need is therefore to begin the process of proposing savings for scrutiny and decision that will conclude with the

agreement of the 2015/16 budget at Council in February 2015. This will be a continuous process based around the Lewisham future programme work strands with saving proposals brought forward when they are ready. This process is set out in section 7.

- 1.5. The report presents £40.6m of new proposals. These are summarised in section 8 and supported by the necessary detail to enable effective scrutiny and decision in the appendices. Of these proposals £29.4m are for 2015/16, with the balance of £11.2m contributing to future year targets.
- 1.6. The report then sets out the necessary financial and legal implications that are required to be considered in respect of these proposals (sections 9 and 10). And concludes with some additional steps being taken to address the budget gap that will form part of the 2015/16 budget report in February 2015 - see section 11.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1. To set out the revenue budget savings proposals that need to be scrutinised to enable a balanced budget for 2015/16 to be put forward to Council in February 2015.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1. Members are invited to scrutinise these proposals through October and November and provide feedback to the Mayor ahead of the Mayor & Cabinet meeting on the 12 November.

4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

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

| Section | Title |
|---------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | Executive summary |
| 2 | Purpose of the report |
| 3 | Recommendations |
| 4 | Structure of the report |
| 5 | Introduction from the Chief Executive |
| 6 | Lewisham Future Programme |
| 7 | Background and timetable |
| 8 | Savings proposals by thematic review |
| 9 | Financial implications |
| 10 | Legal implications |
| 11 | Conclusion |
| 12 | Background documents |
| | Appendices |

5. INTRODUCTION FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Context

- 5.1. Lewisham is fast changing - as London's economy and population is growing. Lewisham has always been a mix of communities - but ever increasing social diversity describes the fabric of our communities today. And while London has plenty of opportunities on offer we know that some of our residents are not benefitting anywhere near enough from London's growth.
- 5.2. This September, some 3,100 Lewisham children aged eleven will start at their new secondary school. An important beginning for each and every child. They will grow up in a London that is expanding as well as changing. Just before they were born (in 2001) London's population was 7.3 million. By the time they will be 20 years old, London will have a population of 9.3 million. By the age of 30, London's population will have increased to 10 million¹. They will move into adulthood in an age of "super competition". To succeed in this emerging era they will need to be capable, creative and confident.

| | <u>2001</u> | <u>2014</u> | <u>2023</u> | <u>2033</u> |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Lewisham | 255,000 | 289,000 | 317,000 | 337,000 |
| London | 7.3m | 8.6m | 9.3m | 10.0m |

- 5.3. But it is not just about the growing numbers of people. London's economy is changing fast. Half of the new jobs forecast in the next five years are expected to be in professional services. The world of work is being transformed; flexible, disciplined, creative and social skills are those that are needed most.
- 5.4. London's population is by far the most economically productive in England and the wider UK. The most recently available data² shows that London's economy is some £310 billion each year compared to £845 billion for the rest of England. When account is taken of relative population size the figures show that London produces over £37,000 per annum in gross economic value per head of population. The average for the rest of England is just over £19,000. The enormity of this economic gap not only amplifies London's attractiveness it also accelerates economic and social change. And it is doing so at a pace not experienced before in any of our life times. It is into this incredibly fast growing and thriving capital city that Lewisham's young people will make their way into the future.
- 5.5. The overall population growth combined with a scarcity of housing and an influx of direct foreign investment into the central London property market has put enormous pressure on the capital's housing market. This has greatly impacted on land values and house prices in central London as well as the adjoining fringe boroughs (including Islington, Hackney, Haringey, Tower Hamlets and the Northern parts of Lambeth and Southwark)³. And it is now having a serious impact on land values and the demand for housing in Lewisham.
- 5.6. These economic and social realities present London's local government with a dramatically different character of challenge to those faced by local Councils in the rest of England. For the past thirty or so years the Council has been providing


¹ GLA (2013) "central forecast" of population for Lewisham and London, London data store

² ONS (July 2014) Regional Growth Value Added (income approach) December 2013; and ONS (May 2014) 2012 based sub-national populations projections for England

³ There has been an 80 per cent growth in private rental housing in London in the past decade.. The average monthly rental for a two bed flat within 800m of the following Council Town Halls is: Camden £2,600; Islington £2,300; Southwark £2,300 (£1,600 if old Town Hall in Peckham); Hackney £1,950; Lambeth £1,900; Haringey £1,900; Tower Hamlets £1,800; Greenwich £1,100; and Lewisham £1,100

good basic services, shaping opportunities and enhancing the quality of life and the quality of life chances for people locally. Working alongside our partner public service agencies we have focussed on public service outcomes. In this style, we have worked in partnership to tackle crime, reduce health inequalities and engage with our many communities locally. But we have also experimented with different approaches to citizen engagement (from citizens' juries, citizens' panels, community conferencing through to, more recently, our 18 local assemblies).

- 5.7. The fact that Lewisham is predominantly a residential borough with a relatively low business base has a significant impact on what we do as a Council. A very large number of our residents are economically active. Over 110,000 of our residents are in work (only eight London Boroughs have higher numbers of residents in work). But Lewisham is itself home to just 53,500 jobs (with only four London Boroughs having lower numbers of jobs; namely, Barking & Dagenham; Haringey; Harrow and Waltham Forest).
- 5.8. One in five of our residents who are in work, work in Lewisham - and many of these work in the public sector (for the Council, local schools, Lewisham Hospital, Goldsmiths, and the Met Police, etc). The table below shows that another one in five work in our neighbouring boroughs, whilst the majority of those who work outside the borough work across the Thames in Central and East London⁴. By contrast, the map shows that residents in Lewisham with relatively low income are overly concentrated in the most southerly and northerly parts of the borough.

| <i>Place of work</i> | <i>Lewisham residents in work</i> | <i>Lewisham income deprivation⁵</i> |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Lewisham | 20,600 |  |
| Southwark | 11,800 | |
| Bromley | 6,500 | |
| Greenwich | 5,400 | |
| Westminster & City | 22,800 | |
| Tower Hamlets | 6,200 | |
| Camden | 6,000 | |
| Lambeth | 6,000 | |
| Islington | 3,400 | |
| Croydon | 2,200 | |

The Government's radical change to funding local Councils


- 5.9. The Government's approach to funding local authorities is a radical departure from the historical practice in funding Councils. First, they departed from the historic approach of all previous Governments (since the 1930s) of allocating Government grant to local areas to promote "equalisation" of local spending to local needs. Between 1981 and 2013 different approaches were used - but all attempted to equalise for differential resource bases and ensure a "standard spend" for a variety of service functions in different areas. Replacing this approach of itself would have had dramatic consequences on Council funding.

⁴ ONS (2014) Census: Origin - Destination statistics of residence and workplace, 25 July 2014

⁵ GLA (2011) English Indices of Deprivation 2010: a London perspective, Intelligence Briefing

- 5.10. But the Government then chose, when allocating its spending reductions as part of the national public austerity programme, to allocate the deepest cuts to its financing of local government. In real terms the funding to local government will have fallen by almost 43 per cent from 2010/11 to 2015/16⁶. The combined effect of these two changes was to lead the Government to focus the budget cuts disproportionately to those Councils with the highest spend - which, of course, also have the highest levels of need. The statistical relationship between Government spending reductions and deprivation has thereby become well known.
- 5.11. In addition, the Government introduced a number of high level policy goals which had a further ratchet effect on the budget savings that Councils have to make. Principally these were designed to focus Council's attention on the "growth agenda" and in particular to incentivise Councils to accept major housing developments. To this end, business rates on new developments have been "localised" and some 7 per cent of the total grant to local government has been "held back" in order for it to be distributed by way of a "new homes bonus" (£700m across England). What's more a further £350m was "held back" as a grant to encourage Councils to freeze their Council Tax. Given the fact that revenue support grant amounts to just £9.77bn, the impact of these policy "hold backs" is very significant. The cumulative impact of these changes compounds the budget challenge to those Councils, like Lewisham, that serve populations with high needs. Lewisham is the 16th most deprived local authority area in England with one of the lowest business bases - it is bound to be effected greatly by these financing changes.
- 5.12. By way of illustration, the chart below shows the Government revenue support funding for this year and next for the seven Councils in this part of London. The scale of the reductions in Lambeth, Southwark, Lewisham and (to a slightly lesser extent) Greenwich are plain to see. The £30m reduction we face for next year is however not the end of the matter - there are more reductions to come. Of course a change in Government may bring changes to the distribution of the local government settlement. But, in truth, there is not much that can be redistributed from those "low need" Councils that receive little by way of grant now. Any future Government that was minded to redress the disadvantages of the current arrangements would need to alter the structural changes made to the local government settlement by the current Government.

Revenue support grant (£m) to Councils in South East London



⁶ House of Commons (September 2014) English local government finance, Research Paper 14/43

5.13. We are in the early days of resetting the Council's strategies; redesigning our services; and renewing our organisation. Following the local elections in May, the Mayor and Council have a fresh mandate to govern for the next four years. The Council's existing policy priorities are being revised to take account of this renewed local agenda. We will be able to do new things and to do things in new ways. We will do so by redirecting our attention, our energies and our resources to meet the changing local political mandate. But the depth and pace of the Government's public austerity programme is unremitting and local government will continue to be subject to substantial revenue reductions over the foreseeable future. As the chart above show, next year alone we will receive £30m less grant from the Government than we got this year.

6. LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME : BACKGROUND

6.1. The Lewisham future programme is the Council's approach to making the transformational changes necessary to reposition itself strongly for the future while living within the financial resources at its disposal. It is guided by the Council's enduring values and principles agreed in 2010, and the newly elected Administration's Manifesto as well as its emerging political priorities.

The last four years

6.2. 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.

- 6.3. Since 2010 over £100m of savings have been made, and in many case the size and shape of our services has changed dramatically.
- 6.4. Staff numbers (Headcount) have reduced from 3,997 to 2,745 (-31%) in that time. The scale of this change is important context – a far more radical and transformative approach is now required.

Meeting the new challenge

- 6.5. For several months now we have known that we need to make £95m of budget savings from 2014/15 to 2017/18. This year (2014/15) we made £10m of reductions that will flow into next year. This reduces the total we need to find to some £85m. The profile of the savings we need to make requires us to find in the region of £40m savings for 2015/16 and £45m over the next two years. So next year is particularly difficult and we will need to make decisions quickly to gain the “full year effect” of any changes that are made. If £40m of savings are agreed three months late we will only make £30m savings thereby compounding our fiscal problem. Timely decision making when making savings of this scale is therefore extremely important.
- 6.6. By 2018 it is likely that, as an organisation, we will be one-third smaller than we are now. It is not a case of simply listing budget savings and applying a weighted set of priorities. We need to be fully understanding of the consequences of any changes we plan to make. Reducing, say, the adoption & fostering budget by 30 per cent will have different consequences to reducing the libraries budget by the same percentage. For the members making these tough choices, priorities do not involve weighing suggested percentage reductions but in weighing their anticipated consequences.

Organisational flexibility

- 6.7. To develop effectively to meet this dramatic budget challenge our organisation needs to be strategic, agile, resilient and flexible. We are presently organised on a “directorates” basis. This ensures role clarity and management accountability for the design and delivery of services. We had five directorates when we had 5,000 staff. We now employ less than 3,000 staff and the numbers are bound to fall further. We are trying to be agile and adaptive in how we manage our people, functions and projects. This is one reason why we have not approached the task of reshaping our budget on a silo or directorate basis.
- 6.8. How we are organised will continue to change as our resource base changes. Put together all these changes will make new demands on staff, managers and Members alike. Of course services will continue to be grouped on a “linked” or “like” basis and of course we will continue to need clear lines of management accountability from services to the Mayor and Council. It is just that the future will involve continuous organisational change. Our Lewisham future programme is a three year programme of change linked to our medium term budget plan. We have structured our savings for next year to foreshadow the savings that will come in the following two years. And once we are delivering the savings for next year we will be recasting our approach for the following two years.

Budget Strategy and the Lewisham future programme

- 6.9. So we face significant challenges. All budgets need to be investigated. All services, activities and functions need to be examined. But there is no point simply turning over every stone. Real changes need to be made. The Mayor and the Council have encouraged managers and staff to be radical and consider all options. That said, we all share a tendency to “preserve and sustain” the best elements of existing services. And this can be so for good reason. But our focus should be on the next generation of citizens and service users.
- 6.10. We need to change services now with the future in mind. After the Mayor and Council have made decisions on the budget savings for 2015/16 we will very swiftly be working out options for the next phase (an additional £45m over the following two years). In some functional service areas the savings we will be making for next year will point to a likely “end state” for the service area concerned; in other areas next year’s savings will be little more than a staging post for setting future direction.
- 6.11. In developing options within the Lewisham future programme officers have been guided by the enduring principles for change agreed in 2010, as well as the broad objectives and principles articulated by the Mayor, Cabinet and elected members in previous budget rounds, and in the Mayor and Labour Group’s Manifesto.
- 6.12. Such principles have informed not just the Lewisham future programme’s overall approach but also many of the specific proposals that have come forward. They include:
- Working in partnership with other public agencies, community groups and exploring opportunities with other local authorities to provide services jointly;
 - Preserving frontline services as far as possible, and where necessary reducing back-office functions to do this; and
 - Prioritising services that support and protect the vulnerable.
- 6.13. The Council secures 150 or so distinct services. These are grouped under common management arrangements to ensure effective and efficient delivery as well as assure accountability to the Mayor and the Council. However, in deciding how services could be shaped for the future, officers have tried to step outside of conventional professional and management silos to imagine how things could be done very differently at lower overall cost. In some service functional areas this is easier than in others.
- 6.14. A core part of the Lewisham future programme are the cross cutting proposals which touch all aspects of council activities. These include:
- reviewing, centralising and reshaping all the business support functions across the Council,
 - exploring how we can increase income (in relation to the services provided to schools, in relation to assets and property management, improving debt recovery and reviewing the council’s investment strategy), and
 - centralising policy, performance and commissioning functions across the organisation to rationalise resource and reshape the functions.
- 6.15. Broader transformational work by officers is underway on exploring the opportunities for increasing shared services, and developing a customer service transformation programme which aims to improve the way that our customers interact with the council and through reshaping the front office reduce costs and

duplication. Both of these projects are at early development and will be developed over time and will require work with stakeholders and members to develop an understanding of ambition.

- 6.16. Almost half of the Council's budget is spent on the combined costs of safeguarding some 2,000 children at risk and delivering care to some 6,000 vulnerable adults- these we have categorised as 'care services'.
- 6.17. In Children's Services, a transformational approach is proposed that will re-align the Early intervention and Social Care Referral and Assessment functions to create a new approach to our front door for access to services, and allow for more integration leading to fewer assessments. Alternative delivery models and level of provision across our early intervention providers in Children's Centres, Targeted Family Support (TFS) and the Family Intervention Project (FIP) are proposed in order to build in greater flexibility to work at lower costs.
- 6.18. Our "care services" for both children's and adults are crucial, but they still need to be changed and made more cost-effective. In adult social care it is inevitable that there will be changes in the shape, scope and standard of care services we can deliver and, as we are outliers in cost of some packages in London, efficiencies are possible. This is unavoidable. Further savings to the Children's Social Care placement and other budgets will also be part of the overall Programme.
- 6.19. Integration of adult social care services with local health services has been developed over the last few years and this highly transformative programme will start to deliver budget savings in 2016/7. The immediate focus for savings will be achieved through looking at ensuring that decisions made in relation to packages of care and those that are made on longer term care, including residential and nursing home placements, are undertaken within a clear framework that enables the service to manage demands within a reduced budget.
- 6.20. Our "core" services provide a basic bedrock of acceptable living for all of our residents (these include, among others, refuse collection, waste disposal, street sweeping, tax collection and the maintenance of the basic local public infrastructure). They are "common good" services and investments for everyone. These "core" services will also be subject to radical change and reform - but in ways that differ dramatically from our approach to care services. Proposals within the Programme include (1) investigating the option of sharing depot and plant costs with other Councils; and (2) changes to service standards.
- 6.21. Our "mandated" services are areas that either the Government requires the Council to secure or the Council itself chooses to focus attention and resources (such as planning & development control, improving school effectiveness, public health, leisure or crime reduction, economic regeneration, housing benefits among very many others). These "mandated" services include spending on activities that are aimed at supporting the social or civil fabric of the borough (such as the community sector, youth services, etc).
- 6.22. The extent to which our spending on these services is scoped by statute or our own policy discretion is highly arguable. Many activities that are described (by service users and service providers alike) as "statutory" are in effect discretionary when it comes to the service standard or the service coverage that is secured. Unless there is a prescribed statutory approach to the service standard, coverage

and quality thresholds, the level of service secured is most usually a matter for the Council to determine in consultation with the service users and with residents (and council taxpayers) locally.

- 6.23. The Lewisham future programme includes proposals on every mandated area. Some proposals such as those on the Youth Service recognises the need to have a clear view of the “end state” for the service so that plans can proceed with that in mind. It sets out two options for the service. The first is to proceed with a mutualisation of the service whilst the second risk reduces funding to the level of a statutory service straight away.
- 6.24. For some of our mandated services we are using the same transformative approaches as used for the high cost ‘care’ services. For instance, we have developed a proposal for a new single enforcement service bringing together some environmental health, community safety, trading standards, public nuisance and licensing – saving money and delivery an integrated service. For other areas proposals are using procurement to reduce costs (such as in Crime reduction or supporting people) or reviewing management and organisational structures (such as in asset management, libraries service, and planning and economic development).
- 6.25. For some areas proposals are developed that seek to further engage local communities in co-providing services with us, for instance in the parks service. Involving communities in shaping the future of our service delivery is a key issue for the Council over the coming period. We need to devise a coherent approach to this for the next phase of the Lewisham future programme.
- 6.26. Finally, the Council spends money on several “corporate” functions to ensure that its efforts are lawful, coordinated, accountable and well run. These include the cost of the corporate and democratic core of the Council, the cost of budget and legal compliance as well as those functions that enable audit, communications and partnership working as well as support assurance to the Mayor and elected Members generally. Proposals are being developed in reducing the support provided by corporate services such as Finance, HR and audit and risk.
- 6.27. Shaping the budget strategy and the Lewisham future programme is the understanding, developed over time with members, based on the principles of protecting the vulnerable and front line, that the base costs of all of our “mandated” services together with these “corporate” functions of the Council will need to be revised substantially and bear the highest rate of cost reduction. And in some instances we may have to radically reduce the financing of these activities.
- 6.28. We are shortly to embark on a wide and deep budget discussion with our service users, our residents generally, our staff and their trade unions. The Mayor and the Council are the prime and ultimate decision makers in the tough public choices ahead. In this way, tough decisions will be made with the benefit of wide public dialogue. There is considerable vitality and dynamism in our communities across Lewisham as well as in the wider London economy. Public sector austerity provides one backcloth to these difficult decisions - but so too does positive cultural diversity, strong inward investment and widening economic opportunities.

7. LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME : PROCESS, PRINCIPLES AND TIMETABLE

- 7.1. The savings challenge for the three financial years 2015/16 to 2017/18 was assessed by Mayor & Cabinet in the Medium Term Financial Strategy in July 2014. This identified the savings requirement to be £85m over the three years as set out in the table below.

| Savings required | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| £m | 39 | 26 | 20 | 85 |

- 7.2. To develop proposals to meet these targets the Council's managers have been considering ideas for change across all functions and services in weekly meetings of the Lewisham Future Board.
- 7.3. This report presents £40.6m of savings proposals generated by the Lewisham future programme across eighteen cross-cutting thematic areas. They will undergo public scrutiny by elected members, followed by consideration and decision by Mayor and Cabinet. They will change and evolve as this process continues and more proposals will come forward in due course. Already, however, they are examples of the new kinds of solutions we now need to be considering:
- integrating more with our partners, in particular social care services with health;
 - managing demand for high cost services like adult and children's social care;
 - looking at new delivery models, like public sector mutuals, voluntary organisations and the private sector;
 - generating more income through our assets, taking a more commercial and entrepreneurial approach, and extending charging for free or low cost services;
 - transforming the way our organisation works by merging teams and collaborating across directorates; and, where appropriate,
 - ceasing some services altogether.
- 7.4. For consistency through this report and to enable further savings proposals to be brought forward as required as part of the 2015/16 budget setting process between now and February 2015 the following referencing will apply.

| LFP Area | Lewisham future programme work strand |
|----------|--|
| A | Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health (incl. Public Health) |
| B | Supporting people |
| C | Sharing services (incl. third party spend) |
| D | Efficiency review |
| E | Asset rationalisation |
| F | Corporate and business support services |
| G | Income generation |
| H | Enforcement and regulation |
| I | Management and corporate overheads |

| LFP Area | Lewisham future programme work strand |
|----------|--|
| J | School effectiveness services |
| K | Crime reduction |
| L | Culture and community services |
| M | Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services |
| N | Environmental services |
| O | Public services |
| P | Planning and economic development |
| Q | Safeguarding and early intervention services |
| R | Customer transformation |

7.5 When setting previous years budgets some savings were agreed that impact on the 2015/16 budget. These are identified in detail in the report setting the 2014/15 budget, agreed at Full Council on the 26 February 2014. In summary they are:

| LFP Area | Previously agreed savings for 2015/16 | Saving £'000 |
|----------|--|--------------|
| E | Savings on JC Decaux contract | 47 |
| I | Performance management system licensing costs | 33 |
| I | Savings on photocopiers and closure on Inprint | 500 |
| J | Charges to schools for Council services | 75 |
| L | Reduce sport development grant & Fusion contract | 50 |
| M | Transfer of Hostels from HRA to General Fund | 200 |
| N | 10% reduction on green space management contract | 250 |
| O | Outsource emergency out of hours service | 100 |
| O | Reorganise service point staffing | 25 |
| Q | Attendance and Welfare service changes | 200 |
| Q | Business support in Children's social care | 50 |
| Q | Looked after children team changes | 100 |
| Q | Use of Council premises for supervised visits | 50 |
| | Total | 1,680 |

7.5. The Lewisham future programme is a rolling programme to allow savings proposals to be brought forward for decision and progressed as and when ready. This is necessary because the scale of the changes and number of variables, including the risks that some of these proposals require the Council to take, mean that the direction of travel for each work strand will need to be continuously assessed and refined.

- 7.6. In broad terms, the overall position in terms of potential savings still to be identified, assuming all the proposals included in this report were taken, is set out in the table below.

| Lewisham Future Programme - gap to target for three years 2015/16 to 2017/18 (assuming all proposals agreed) | Gap £m |
|---|-------------------|
| A. Integration of social care and health (incl. Public Health) | 12 |
| B. Supporting people | |
| C. Shared services (and third part spend) | 12 |
| D. Efficiency review | |
| E. Asset rationalisation | 6 |
| F. Corporate and business support services | 1 |
| G. Income generation | 2 |
| H. Enforcement and regulation | 1 |
| I. Management and corporate overheads | 5 |
| J. School effectiveness | |
| K. Crime reduction | |
| L. Culture and community services | |
| M. Housing strategy and non HRA funded services | |
| N. Environmental services | 3 |
| O. Public services | |
| P. Planning and economic development | |
| Q. Safeguarding and early intervention services | 1 |
| R. Customer transformation | 2 |
| Total | 45 |

- 7.7. To enable proposals by work strand to be brought forward on a continuous basis, the report has been structured to present an overview for each work strand as follows:
- the numbers (previously agreed, proposals, expected to follow);
 - explanation of the services in review; and
 - a summary of the savings proposals being submitted for scrutiny and decision to enable them to be progressed.
- 7.8. The detail of the savings proposals are then provided in the appendices, including any specific legal implications.
- 7.9. Going forward until the budget report in February 2015 the narrative will remain broadly unchanged with the tables updated where required and revised appendices attached to enable the decisions being requested to be put forward at the relevant time. These updates will be circulated prior to the relevant meetings.
- 7.10. Once the budget for 2015/16 has been set this report will be rebased with the narratives updated and numbers (in particular the targets) refreshed for future Lewisham future programme work.

- 7.11 Working towards setting the Council's annual budget for 2015/16 in February 2015 this means savings proposals for scrutiny and the key Mayor and Cabinet (M&C) dates are as follows:

| Review of Savings proposals | Children & Young People | Healthier | Housing | Public Accounts | Safer Stronger | Sustainable |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Select Cttee. | 2 Oct | 21 Oct | 1 Oct | 5 Nov | 3 Nov | 30 Oct |
| M&C | 12 Nov | 12 Nov | 12 Nov | 12 Nov | 12 Nov | 12 Nov |
| Select Cttee. | 15 Dec | 2 Dec | 17 Dec | 10 Dec | 3 Dec | 9 Dec |
| M&C | 14 Jan | 14 Jan | 14 Jan | 14 Jan | 14 Jan | 14 Jan |
| Select Cttee. | 4 Feb | 14 Jan | 28 Jan | 5 Feb + Budget | 22 Jan | 20 Jan |
| M&C | 11 Feb | 11 Feb | 11 Feb | 11 Feb + Budget | 11 Feb | 11 Feb |

- 7.12 Each M&C decision would then be subject to the usual Business Panel scrutiny call in process and reconsideration at the following M&C if necessary.

8. SAVING PROPOSALS BY THEMATIC REVIEW

- 8.1. The table below presents the current position. It summarises the savings position for each of the Lewisham future programme work strands for 15/16 (previously agreed, proposed and expected) and proposals for the future years 16/17 and 17/18.

| LFP Area | 15/16 £'000 Prev. | 15/16 £'000 Prop. | 15/16 £'000 Expect. | 15/16 £'000 Total | 16/17 £'000 Prop. | 17/18 £'000 Prop. |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Proposals | 1,680 | 29,426 | 770 | 31,876 | 6,462 | 4,696 |
| Target | 1,680 | 37,320 | | 39,000 | 26,000 | 20,000 |
| Gap | 0 | -7,894 | | -7,124 | -19,538 | -15,304 |
| By Area | | | | | | |
| A | 0 | 10,282 | 0 | 10,282 | 0 | 0 |
| B | 0 | 1,349 | 0 | 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| D | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| E | 47 | 949 | 0 | 996 | 760 | 985 |
| F | 0 | 900 | 0 | 900 | 0 | 0 |
| G | 0 | 974 | 0 | 974 | 0 | 0 |
| H | 0 | 800 | 0 | 800 | 0 | 0 |
| I | 533 | 2,090 | 0 | 2,623 | 0 | 0 |
| J | 75 | 751 | 0 | 826 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 0 | 974 | 350 | 1,324 | 30 | 0 |
| L | 50 | 1,405 | 420 | 1,875 | 375 | 0 |
| M | 200 | 700 | 0 | 900 | 200 | 100 |
| N | 250 | 740 | 0 | 990 | 0 | 0 |

| LFP Area | 15/16 | 15/16 | 15/16 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 |
|----------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|-------|-------|
| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| | Prev. | Prop. | Expect. | Total | Prop. | Prop. |
| O | 125 | 650 | 0 | 775 | 200 | 0 |
| P | 0 | 229 | 0 | 229 | 0 | 0 |
| Q | 400 | 4,133 | 0 | 4,533 | 1,223 | 111 |
| R | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

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

A. Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

8.4. Overview

| Proposals - A | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------|----------|---------------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 10,282 | 0 | 0 | 10,282 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 10,282 | 0 | 0 | 10,282 |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities | | | |

8.5. Adult social care needs to meet the challenge of unprecedented financial pressures and, at the same time, needs to respond to increases in the level and complexity of demand, and meet the new obligations introduced by the Care Act. Following a review and an analysis of expenditure (using the LGA's Towards Excellence in Adult Social Care tool) savings proposals for 15/16 in adult social care have been identified - as ones which are outliers in terms of expenditure showing higher than average expenditure when benchmarked against comparator boroughs. These savings proposals have been developed in accordance with the legislation that governs the delivery of adult social care.

8.6. For 15/16, the identified proposed savings will be achieved primarily through ensuring that decisions made in relation to packages of care and those that are made on longer term care, including residential and nursing home placements, are undertaken within a clear framework that enables the service to manage demands within a reduced budget.

8.7. For 16/17 and beyond, savings proposals will come from the planned activity within the Adult Integrated Care Programme which will, amongst other things, deliver effective advice and support for self care, develop and improve access to community based care, and link individuals to community networks of support.

8.8. In addition, this thematic review has incorporated the work that has been undertaken in Public Health funding which will be reinvested in services with clear public health outcomes.

8.9. A more detailed introduction providing additional context to the approach taken to preparing the smarter and deeper integration of social care and health, public health and supporting people proposals is provided at Appendix 2 to this report.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-A for detailed proposals)

8.10. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|--------------|---|---------------|----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| A1 | This proposal will ensure that a consistent approach is taken in meeting care and support needs in the most cost effective way. This may result in some community based packages of care ending or being reduced where needs can be met in different and more cost effective ways. | 2,680 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |
| A2 | The majority of this savings proposal (£900k) represents a negotiated reduction in 24 hour individual prices of care packages. £550K of saving relates to pathway clarification and redesign. The final £50 relates to the extension of charging to people using supported living services. | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |
| A3 | Reconfiguring sensory services provision. | 150 | 0 | 0 | Y | Y |
| A4 | Remodelling building based day services and associated transport costs. | 1,300 | 0 | 0 | Y | Y |
| A5 | Charging for Adult Social Care Services. | 275 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |
| A6 | Public Health programme review (I) | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |
| A7 | Mental Health provision | 250 | 0 | 0 | N | N |
| A8 | Public Health programme review (II) | 1,777 | 0 | 0 | Y | Y |
| A9 | Review of services to support people to live at home | 250 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |
| A10 | Proposal in respect of recouping health costs | 600 | 0 | 0 | N | N |
| Total | | 10,282 | 0 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

B. Supporting People

8.11. Overview

| Proposals - B | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 | 2,523 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 | 2,523 |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities | | | |

8.12. In Lewisham, housing-related support is delivered by a number of service providers to clients with a range of needs (this was formerly funded via the Supporting People budget). Support takes place across different accommodation settings: high-support hostels, shared supported housing and in the community via floating support. As well as funding a number of schemes providing generic support for vulnerable adults such as sheltered housing Lewisham runs specialist projects for individual client groups, such as drug and alcohol users, women experiencing violence and exploitation, people with mental health, learning disabilities, older people, and rough sleepers.

8.13. A more detailed introduction providing additional context to the approach taken to preparing the smarter and deeper integration of social care and health, public health and supporting people proposals is provided at Appendix 2 to this report.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-B for detailed proposals)

8.14. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|--------------|--|--------------|--------------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| B1 | Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity, reductions in service capacity, service closures, a review of mental health services across the board lends itself to changes in what is currently commissioned via the SP programme, and a complete reconfiguration and re-procurement of all remaining floating support services. | 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 | N | Y |
| Total | | 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

C. Shared Service

8.15. Overview

| Proposals - C | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts | | | |

- 8.16. There are a number of good examples of sharing services that already exist across the Council and indeed some of the other projects within the Lewisham Future Programme are exploring opportunities to further maximise this potential, often through joint procurement. As a starting point, this project is gathering all of these examples together so we can look strategically across the programme at future ways of working with other local authorities and partners.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-C for detailed proposals)

- 8.17. There are no specific saving proposals at this time.

D. Efficiency Review

- 8.18. Overview

| Proposals - D | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 7,500 |
| Proposed now | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 7,500 |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts | | | |

- 8.19. In setting the 2014/15 budget the decision was agreed to effect this efficiency saving by means of holding back an annual amount of £2.5m of non-pay inflation when setting service budgets. It is anticipated that this approach will continue for the remainder of the programme (i.e. to 2017/18). This assumption will be re-proposed for agreement as part of setting the Council's annual budget in February each year.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-D for detailed proposals)

- 8.20. There are no further specific saving proposals at this time.

E. Asset Rationalisation

- 8.21. Overview

| Proposals - E | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 47 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Proposed now | 949 | 760 | 985 | 2,694 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 996 | 760 | 985 | 2,741 |

| Proposals - E | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development | | | |

8.22. The review of the Council's current asset arrangements is linked to the delivery of the regeneration programme. The programme has five key strands of activity linked to rationalising the corporate estate and the facilities management thereof, generating income through the asset portfolio, reviewing arrangements for our commercial estate, energy generation and supply, and the structure of the service.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-E for detailed proposals)

8.23. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|--------------|--|--------------|------------|------------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| E1 | Structural re-organisation of the Regeneration & Asset Management Division. | 600 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |
| E2 | Efficiencies in the current facilities management contracts and optimising the current operational estate (reduction in the quantum of office accommodation). | 190 | 305 | 670 | N | N |
| E3 | New ways in generating income from assets. | 0 | 0 | 200 | Y | N |
| E4 | Generating increased income, based on up-to-date market rates, better use of properties and effective rent collection. Also includes the transfer of commercial assets from the HRA to the GF. | 50 | 445 | 100 | N | N |
| E5 | Energy efficiency measures | 109 | 10 | 15 | N | Y |
| Total | | 949 | 760 | 985 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

8.24. Further areas to the above are being considered, including an expected £5.7m to be delivered through the generation of new income from the regeneration of existing Council assets. However, this will only be delivered by 2021, beyond the timeframe for the Lewisham future programme.

F. Corporate and Business Support Services

8.25. Overview

| Proposals - F | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 900 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,900 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposals - F | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Total | 900 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,900 |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts | | | |

8.26. This is a review of all business support arrangements across the organisation. The review aims to centralise, rationalise and streamline the service into a single professionalised service.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-F for detailed proposals)

8.27. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|--|--------------|----------|--------------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| F1 | Establishment of a centrally located, corporate business support service which combines a general support function with specialist service hubs. | 900 | 0 | 1,000 | Y | N |
| | Total | 900 | 0 | 1,000 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

8.28. Further phases of work will consider opportunities to rationalise senior management support and review case-work processes and structures.

G. Income Generation

8.29. Overview

| Proposals - G | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|------------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 974 | 0 | 0 | 974 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 974 | 0 | 0 | 974 |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts | | | |

8.30. This review is considering approaches to optimise income generation through: changes to the Council's fees and charges structures, increasing charges to schools, improving debt collection and reviewing the council's current investment strategy.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-G for detailed proposals)

8.31. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|---------------------------------|--------------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| G1 | Changes to our fees and charges | 974 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|---|--------------|----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| | structures, reviewing charges to our School Service Level Agreements (SLAs), improving debt collection and reviewing the council's current investment strategy. | | | | | |
| | Total | 974 | 0 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

8.32. The required consultation report for the blue badge element of this proposal is attached at Appendix 3.

8.33. This work strand is also:

- conducting an audit of advertising opportunities in the borough,
- looking at embedding some key principles to increase income across the Council,
- implementing a formal annual review of fees and charges, and
- setting a clear income strategy and improving commercialism.

H. Enforcement and Regulation

8.34. Overview

| Proposals - H | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|------------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 800 | 0 | 0 | 800 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 800 | 0 | 0 | 800 |
| Select Committee | Safer Stronger Communities | | | |

8.35. This involves reviewing enforcement and regulation services in order to group services together into a community protection hub, public realm hub and built environment hub. The review will also look at opportunities to deliver savings proposals through alternative delivery models.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-H for detailed proposals)

8.36. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|--|--------------|----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| H1 | Restructuring of enforcement and regulatory services | 800 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |
| | Total | 800 | 0 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

I. Management and corporate overheads

8.37. Overview

| Proposals - I | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 533 | 0 | 0 | 533 |
| Proposed now | 2,090 | 0 | 0 | 2,090 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2,623 | 0 | 0 | 2,623 |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts | | | |

8.38. This is a review of all management and professional back office functions to identify options to reduce spend by between 30-50%. This has included: a review of Corporate and Democratic costs, Policy, Strategy and Performance functions, Commissioning and Procurement arrangements, Legal, Human Resources, Information Technology, Finance and Audit & Risk services.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-I for detailed proposals)

8.39. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| I1 | Savings in management overheads, commissioning, and professional services budgets covering Finance, Legal Services, Audit and Risk, Human Resources and IMT. | 2,090 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |
| Total | | 2,090 | 0 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

J. School Effectiveness

8.40. Overview

| Proposals – J | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 75 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| Proposed now | 751 | 0 | 0 | 751 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 826 | 0 | 0 | 826 |
| Select Committee | Children and Young People | | | |

8.41. This strand is looking at all aspects of services to schools to identify opportunities to increase income (most of which are set out in the income generation review above). In addition, savings proposals of £751k have been identified through

reducing the central funding for Educational Psychologists; through grant substitution from the DSG around the management of our early years function and from the Basic Needs Grant for staff working on the expansion of school places.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-J for detailed proposals)

8.42. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| J1 | The proposal to increase the income from the Service Level Agreement which will increase the costs for schools which will need to be paid for from the Individual Schools Budget block of the DSG. | 751 | 0 | 0 | N | N |
| Total | | 751 | 0 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

K. Crime Reduction

8.43. Overview

| Proposals – K | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 974 | 30 | 0 | 1,004 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 350 | 0 | 0 | 350 |
| Total | 1,324 | 0 | 0 | 1,354 |
| Select Committee | Safer Stronger Communities | | | |

8.44. This is a review of Drug & Alcohol and Youth Offending Services to identify opportunities for reshaping provision in 2015/16.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-K for detailed proposals)

8.45. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|---|--------------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| K1 | The Prevention and Inclusion service will be tendering a number of services to increase efficiencies while reducing and targeting provision such as residential rehabilitation. | 574 | 30 | 0 | Y | N |
| K2 | Restructure of YOS service and changes in interventions and reduction in some contracts. | 200 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|--------------|--|--------------|-----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| K3 | Withdraw funding from the case mgt/support team element of the Integrated Offender Management Service. | 200 | 0 | 0 | N | N |
| Total | | 974 | 30 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

- 8.46. This work strand is also undertaking work to identify at least a further £350k of saving proposals that will need to be brought forward at a later date but in time to be included in the February 2015/16.

L. Culture and Community Services

8.47. Overview

| Proposals – L | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Proposed now | 1,405 | 375 | 0 | 1,780 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 420 | 0 | 0 | 420 |
| Total | 1,875 | 375 | 0 | 2,250 |
| Select Committee | Safer Stronger Communities | | | |

- 8.48. This is a review of the Council's grants programme and a review of the management arrangements for library services and the theatre in 2015/16. The proposal for the grants programme is currently out to public consultation, following agreement from Mayor & Cabinet in July 2014, and if agreed will be operational from July 2015.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-L for detailed proposals)

- 8.49. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| L1 | Review of VCS grants programme. | 1,125 | 375 | 0 | N | Y |
| L2 | Libraries staff reorganisation. | 280 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |
| Total | | 1,405 | 375 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

- 8.50. Further work is currently underway to develop savings proposals of at least £420k for 2015/16. This work is reviewing the budgets for Arts and Sports Development, Leisure, Theatre and the Local Assemblies.

M. Housing Strategy and non-HRA funded services

8.51. Overview

| Proposals – M | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Previously agreed | 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 |
| Proposed now | 700 | 200 | 100 | 1,000 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 900 | 200 | 100 | 1,200 |
| Select Committee | Housing | | | |

8.52. This review covers the whole of the Strategic Housing division (including Housing Needs, Private Sector Housing Agency and Housing Strategy & Programmes). It aims to identify how services can be reshaped to meet rising demand at a lower cost, as well as creating opportunities to generate additional income. HRA-funded services are excluded from scope as they will be considered within the Income Generation review.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-M for detailed proposals)

8.53. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|---|--------------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| M1 | Transfer of non-housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund. | 700 | 200 | 100 | N | N |
| | Total | 1,405 | 375 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

N. Environmental Services

8.54. Overview

| Proposals – N | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|------------|
| Previously agreed | 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 |
| Proposed now | 740 | 0 | 0 | 740 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 990 | 0 | 0 | 990 |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development | | | |

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

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-N for detailed proposals)

8.56. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| N1 | To close and cease to maintain a number of small parks, highways enclosures and closed churchyards and reduce management and management support posts | 340 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |
| N2 | Reduction in street cleansing frequencies and cleansing management costs. | 400 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |
| Total | | 740 | 0 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

O. Public Services

8.57. Overview

| Proposals – O | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------------|----------|------------|
| Previously agreed | 125 | 0 | 0 | 125 |
| Proposed now | 650 | 200 | 0 | 850 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 775 | 200 | 0 | 975 |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts | | | |

8.58. This is aiming to review all aspects of services within the scope of public services to reduce cost, improve collection and streamline service delivery providing the capacity to take on additional customer facing services at low or no cost. Saving proposals of £850k to 2017/18 are currently being proposed.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-O for detailed proposals)

8.59. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

8.60. The required consultation report for the discretionary freedom pass proposal is attached at Appendix 4.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|--|--------------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| O1 | End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme. | 200 | 0 | 0 | N | Y |
| O2 | Review Parking Contract Client Team. | 50 | 0 | 0 | N | N |
| O3 | Set up an internal 'enforcement agency' (bailiff) service to collect | 400 | 200 | | N | N |

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|--|--------------|------------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| | Council Tax and other debts. The internal bailiff service will generate income from the statutory fees charged to debtors. The 'saving' is the net surplus income once operational costs have been taken into account. | | | | | |
| | Total | 650 | 200 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

P. Planning and Economic Development

8.61. Overview

| Proposals – P | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|------------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 229 | 0 | 0 | 229 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 229 | 0 | 0 | 229 |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development | | | |

8.62. The Planning Service was last re-structured in September 2011 to facilitate a Development Management approach to the handling of planning applications and to integrate the administration functions within the Area teams to reduce fragmentation of the handling of planning applications. This review seeks to further embed the principles of Development Management. Saving proposals totalling £229k are currently being proposed.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-P for detailed proposals)

8.63. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|---|--------------|----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| P1 | Restructure of planning service and Cutting funding for legal locum to deal with s106 agreements that is no longer required | 229 | 0 | 0 | Y | N |
| | Total | 229 | 0 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

Q. Early Intervention and Safeguarding

8.64. Overview

| Proposals – Q | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|---|--------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| Previously agreed | 400 | 0 | 0 | 400 |
| Proposed now | 7,341 -3,208 4,133 | 1,223 | 111 | 3,208 and 5,467 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4,533 | 1,223 | 111 | 5,867 |
| Select Committee | Children and Young People | | | |

8.65. This strand of work is in two parts:

i) Early intervention and safeguarding

8.66. These proposals involve a re-alignment of the Early intervention and Social Care Referral and Assessment functions to create a new approach to our front door for access to services. Early Intervention Services have been moved into Children Social Care (CSC) to ready both services for more integration leading to fewer assessments which should allow us to reduce staffing levels. This strand also proposes alternative delivery models and level of provision across our early intervention providers in Children’s Centres, Targeted Family Support (TFS) and the Family Intervention Project (FIP) to build in greater flexibility to work at lower costs. It proposes a reduction in the unit costs of working with a family and a reduction by a third of the number of families we support. Greater use of the Troubled Families grant with these families will deliver further savings to the General Fund. The strand also proposes further savings to the Children’s Social Care placement and other budgets. In this strand savings proposals of £5.5m are set out, of which £4.18m is proposed for 2015/16; £1.2m for 2016/17 and £111k for 2017/18.

8.67. In 2015/16, £3.2m of the savings proposed in this strand is required in order to re-set the Children’s Social Care placements budget so will not count towards Lewisham future programme savings proposals – see explanation below.

ii) Youth Services

8.68. This strand proposes savings of at least **£1.4m** for the Youth Service. It recognises the need to have a clear view of the ‘end state’ for the service so that plans can proceed with that in mind. It sets out two options for the service. The first is to proceed with a mutualisation of the service following the delivery of the proposed savings, with the Council funding the mutual for three years, after which funding is withdrawn. The proposals set out the risk that, at the end of the three years, without some level of continuing Council funding, services above the statutory minimum might not be able to be sustained. The second option is to reduce funding to the level of a statutory service straight away. Proposed savings under Option 2 increase to **£3.1m**. The strand also sets out proposals relating to a reconfiguration of our youth re-engagement services, including the Mayor’s NEET programme and services offered at Baseline.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-Q for detailed proposals)

8.69. The table below sets out in summary the individual proposals being brought forward for decision now.

| Ref | Description | Amount £'000 | | | SI | PC |
|-----|--|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----|----|
| | | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | | |
| Q1 | These proposals involve a re alignment of the Early Intervention and Social Care Referral and Assessment functions to create a new approach to our front door and triage for access to services. | 4,181 <u>-3,208</u> 973 | 1,223 | 111 | Y | Y |
| Q2 | Review of Youth Services. | 3,160 | 0 | 0 | Y | Y |
| | Total | 4,133 | 0 | 0 | | |

Key:

SI - Staff Implications

PC - Public Consultation Required

8.70. The explanation for the in-year budget saving relates to the budgets for Looked After Children placements, supporting adopted children and placements for Care Leavers which need to be re-set. While the numbers in these categories are not growing, the budgets do not reflect the actual numbers of children and young people who need to be supported. The Directorate for Children and Young People has, in previous years, covered the gaps through various management actions but the savings made in previous years mean that there is no longer the flexibility for those actions to cover the gaps. That has led to the current in-year overspend in the Children's Social Care placements budget. In order to re-set the budget, further savings proposals of £3.2m have had to be found. It is proposed that these savings come from the early intervention and safeguarding review strand as set out in Section 18 above.

8.71. The required consultation reports for both the Q1 and Q2 proposals are attached at Appendix 5 and 6 respectively.

R. Customer Service Transformation

8.72. Overview

| Proposals - R | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Previously agreed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed now | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| To follow for 15/16 budget | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts | | | |

8.73. The Customer Transformation Review is an 'enabling' strand of the Lewisham future programme. The ambition of the review is to transform the way end-to-end customer contact is delivered across the authority. The review is driven by the following three strands:

- The Access Channel Strategy

- Single Assessment and Case Management
- Front Office Review

8.74. The first phase of the review is examining housing benefit and housing needs processes to identify opportunities to streamline and automate processes and join assessment functions together. The review is currently testing a number of hypotheses which will inform savings proposals for the next financial year.

Summary of proposed savings (see Appendix 1-R for detailed proposals)

8.75. There are no specific saving proposals at this time.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1. This report is concerned with the saving proposals it presents to enable the Council to set a balanced budget in 2015/16 and address the future financial challenges it faces. There are no direct financial implications arising from the report other than those stated in the report itself.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Savings proposals - General Legal Implications

Statutory duties

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

Reasonableness and proper process

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

Staffing reductions

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

Equalities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 10.9. The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at:
<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>
- 10.10. The EHRC has also issued Guidance entitled “Making Fair Financial Decisions”. It appears at Appendix 7 and attention is drawn to its contents.
- 10.11. The equalities implications pertaining to the specific service reductions are particular to the specific reduction.

The Human Rights Act

- 10.12. Since the introduction of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) the rights set out in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) have been incorporated into UK law and can be enforced in the UK courts without recourse to the European courts.
- 10.13. Those articles which are particularly relevant in to public services are as follows:-
- | | | |
|------------|---|---|
| Article 2 | - | the right to life |
| Article 3 | - | the right not to be subject to inhuman or degrading treatment |
| Article 5 | - | the right to security of the person |
| Article 6 | - | the right to a fair trial |
| Article 8 | - | the right to a private and family life, home and correspondence |
| Article 9 | - | the right to freedom of thought ,conscience and religion |
| Article 10 | - | the right to freedom of expression |
| Article 11 | - | the right to peaceful assembly |
| Article 14 | - | the right not to be discriminated against on any ground |

The first protocol to the ECHR added

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

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

Crime and Disorder

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

Best value

- 10.16. The Council remains under a duty under Section 3 Local Government Act 1999 to secure continuous improvement in the way its functions are exercised, having

regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. It must have regard to this duty in making decisions in respect of this report.

Environmental implications

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

Specific legal implications

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

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1. The Council expects to need to make further savings of around £85m between now and 2017/18. This figure is subject to change as financing estimates are refined and government resourcing proposals confirmed. Of this total the gap for 2015/16 is £39m to enable the Council to set a balanced budget, as it is required to do in law.
- 11.2. In addition, going into the 2015/16 budget cycle, the Council is carrying a £3m budget gap which was agreed to be funded from reserves when setting the 2014/15 budget.
- 11.3. The saving proposals in this report reflect the work of the Lewisham future programme board between November 2013 and August 2014. This work continues. For 2015/16 the report presents £31.1m of potential savings – £1.7m of previously agreed savings and £29.4 of new savings proposals – towards the required £39m.
- 11.4. For 2015/16 this leaves a gap of £7.9m and the existing £3m call on reserves. In respect of closing this gap the report identifies at least £0.8m of expected further savings proposals to follow. When presented and if agreed, this would reduce the gap to £7.1m.
- 11.5. As noted in the Medium Term Financial Strategy report presented to M&C in July 2014, a corporate review in respect of reserves and provisions and the use of the New Homes Bonus is underway. Contributions to the Council’s budget position from this work will be included in the assumptions presented for agreement in the budget setting report in February 2015.
- 11.6. While these savings proposals for 2015/16 are being considered the Lewisham future programme continues its work to identify and bring forward additional savings in respect of 2016/17 and 2017/18.

12. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

| Short Title of Report | Date | Contact |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Medium Term Financial Strategy | 16 July 2014 | David Austin |

For further information on this report, please contact:

David Austin, Head of Corporate Resources on 020 8314 9114

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 is one document.

It sets out the individual templates for specific savings proposals. These are grouped by Lewisham future programme work strand and referenced in sections A to R.

Appendices 2 to 7 are in one document

Appendices 2 to 6 provide more information in respect of the public consultations required for these proposals

APPENDIX 2 – Context for Adult Social Care (A) & Supporting People (B)

APPENDIX 3 – Blue badge administration charge (G1) proposal report

APPENDIX 4 – Discretionary Freedom Pass change (O1) proposal report

APPENDIX 5 – Early Intervention and Safeguarding (Q1) proposal report

APPENDIX 6 – Youth Services (Q2) proposal report

APPENDIX 7 – Making fair financial decisions

Two maps are provided as separate documents

- Children Centres
- Youth Services

APPENDIX 1 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY

Contents page

| | |
|--|------------|
| Appendix 1 Section A - Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health | 39 |
| A1: Cost effective care packages..... | 39 |
| A2: Reduction in cost of Learning Disability provision..... | 43 |
| A3: Changes to sensory services provision | 48 |
| A4: Remodelling building based day services | 52 |
| A5: Charging for Adult Social Care services..... | 56 |
| A6: Public Health programme review (I)..... | 59 |
| A7: Cost effective care for Mental Health..... | 65 |
| A8: Public Health programme review (II)..... | 69 |
| A9: Review of services to support people to live at home..... | 77 |
| A10: Proposal in respect of recouping health costs..... | 80 |
| Appendix 1 Section B - Supporting People..... | 84 |
| B1: Reduction & remodelling of Supporting People housing & floating support services | 84 |
| Appendix 1 Section C - Shared Services | |
| Appendix 1 Section D - Efficiency Review | |
| Appendix 1 Section E - Asset Rationalisation | 91 |
| E1: Re-organisation of Regeneration & Asset Management division | 91 |
| E2: Optimisation of operational estate | 94 |
| E3: Creating income from asset portfolio | 98 |
| E4: Improving rent collection for commercial assets..... | 102 |
| E5: Energy efficient measures..... | 106 |
| Appendix 1 Section F – Corporate & Business Support Services | 110 |
| F1: Centralisation of business support services | 110 |
| Appendix 1 Section G – Income Generation | 114 |
| G1: Increasing income from services to schools, debt collection & investment strategy | 114 |
| Appendix 1 Section H – Enforcement & Regulation | 119 |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| H1: Restructuring of enforcement & regulatory services | 119 |
| Appendix 1 Section I – Corporate and Management Overheads | 123 |
| I1: Reduction in corporate management and professional support services | 123 |
| Appendix 1 Section J – Schools Effectiveness | 131 |
| J1: Increasing income from Educational Psychologists and Learning Difficulties teams | 131 |
| Appendix 1 Section K – Crime Reduction..... | 135 |
| K1: Retendering & targeted reduction in Drug & Alcohol services..... | 135 |
| K2: YOS reorganisation, changes in interventions & reduction in contracts | 139 |
| K3: Reduction in funding for Integrated Offender Management service | 143 |
| Appendix 1 Section L – Culture & Community Services | 111 |
| L1: Review of main voluntary & community service grants programme..... | 11147 |
| L2: Libraries staff reorganisation..... | 151 |
| Appendix 1 Section M – Housing & non-HRA funded services..... | 11854 |
| M1: Transfer of non housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund | 118 |
| Appendix 1 Section N – Environmental Services..... | 122 |
| N1: Reduction in maintenance of some small parks, highways & reduced management | 122 |
| N2: Reduction in street cleansing frequency & management costs..... | 125 |
| Appendix 1 Section O – Public Services | 12864 |
| O1: End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme..... | 128 |
| O2: Reduction in staffing for parking contract client team..... | 13268 |
| O3: Set up an internal ‘enforcement agency’ to collect Council Tax & other debts..... | 135 |
| Appendix 1 Section P – Planning Service | 138 |
| P1: Restructure of the planning service | 138 |
| Appendix 1 Section Q – Safeguarding & Early Intervention Services | 142 |
| Q1: Improve triage for Children’s Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer | 142 |
| Q1 – supplementary - Improve triage for Children’s Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer | 148 |
| Q2: Reduction in Youth Service provision..... | 151 |
| Appendix 1 Section R - Customer Transformation | |

Appendix 1 Section A - Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health

An introduction providing additional context to the approach taken to preparing the smarter and deeper integration of social care and health, public health and supporting people proposals is provided at Appendix 2 to this report.

A1: Cost effective care packages

| Cost Effective Care Packages | |
|--|--|
| Lead officer | Joan Hutton |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing and Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A1 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p>At any point in the year approximately 3,400 working age and older adults are receiving community based packages of care. In accordance with the Community Care Act requirements 1990, the Council has a statutory duty to provide an assessment of need to those local residents who request this and to review annually those existing service users who are in receipt of care.</p> <p>A primary objective of the assessment and review process is to assess an individual's needs and risk. The subsequent support plan aims to identify ways in which people can be supported to be as self sufficient as possible, and to provide timely intervention that promotes independence and where possible reduce the need for long term care and support.</p> <p>This proposal will ensure that a consistent approach is taken in meeting care and support needs in the most cost effective way. This may result in some community based packages of care ending or being reduced where needs can be met in different and more cost effective ways.</p> |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 49826.5 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 34,725.4 | (3,375.4) | 31,350.0 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 2,680 | 0 | 0 | 2,680 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| The cost of care packages is influenced by national eligibility criteria. In Lewisham this is currently set at meeting needs for those people with substantial and critical levels of need . It is not proposed to change the current eligibility criteria, as the new national eligibility criteria will be introduced in April 2015 as part of the implementation of the Care Act. The changes relating to the Care Act potentially mean that more people may be eligible for support and therefore it is important that new demands are met within budget. |

3. Description of service and proposal

Both the assessment of need and a more creative and flexible approach to support planning and the use of resources will be consistently applied across all client groups. This will ensure that new and ongoing packages of care which are provided to adults to meet their needs are done so in a more cost effective way.

The laundry service contract is coming to an end. This is a discretionary service provided where we are putting in domestic care services. The proposal is not to renew this contract and to meet this need in a more cost effective way by using personal budgets/direct payments to pay for the domestic care worker to use the person's own washing machine or launderette facilities, that most people are able to access.

The Meals on Wheels contract will not be renewed and individuals in receipt of this service will be offered alternative options for the provision of a meal. For example, arranging for them to access supermarket home delivery services using personal budgets.

Saving proposal description

During an assessment or review, all packages of care will be reviewed to ensure that they continue to meet eligible needs and support plans identify the most creative, flexible and cost effective way of meeting those needs. This will include taking account of personal assets and the contributions an individual can make to ensure their needs are met. In addition, the service will continue to encourage more people to take up the use of direct payments and use that funding to procure their own support and care.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Where a person's needs no longer meet the eligibility criteria, or where it has been identified that the need could be met in a way that does not require the Council to procure a service to meet that need, following an assessment or review, eligible needs may be met in a different and cheaper way. This means that for some people a service that they were receiving may change or be discontinued or that an alternative provision to the one they had been receiving be introduced. However the support plan will ensure that their eligible needs are still met.

Staff who develop and monitor support plans will work with the individual user to explore community and voluntary options that could be used to meet their needs. We will continue to work with the community and voluntary sector to identify gaps in the current market and help them to develop their offer.

We will continue to encourage people to help themselves by promoting access to universal services. There will be no impact on staff from this proposal.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Service users will have choice and control in the development of their support plans to meet their eligible needs within their personal budget. However any change to a package of care following an assessment or review, may cause stress to the service user. However eligible users will continue to receive support from care management staff and will be supported to make the transition to their new plan. In addition, we will continue to work with Services Users and their Carers to give appropriate advice and information on universal/community options. Assessing staff will ensure that people have received up-to-date benefits checks. Commissioners will work with the local market providers to develop new services.

Whilst Direct Payments are steadily increasing, we need to continue with increasing the number of Personal Assistants to work with users in Lewisham. A personal assistant can be employed directly by the service user and provide them with flexibility and choice over the services they receive.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|--|--|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | Corporate Priorities:- | |
| J. | | H. | | A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| High | | | Low | | |

| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | High | | | | |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|---|------|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|--|--|--|----|--|

| 6. Legal | |
|---|--|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|-----|

7. Human Resources

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | No |
|--|--|----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
***(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim**
**** (covered by council employee)**
***** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state**

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 - SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender: | Female: | Male: | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | |

A2: Reduction in cost of Learning Disability provision

| Reduction in costs of Learning Disability Provision | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Lead officer | Dee Carlin |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing and Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A2 |
| Short summary of proposal | Learning Disability |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: £26,930.4 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 29,403.4 | (2,473.0) | 26,930.4 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| This service provides support to residents with a learning disability who meet FACs eligibility criteria. |
| Saving proposal description |
| Area 1 - The majority of this savings proposal (£0.9m) represents a negotiated reduction in 24 hour individual prices of care packages. It is expected that the majority of this will be managed through an increase in shared hours between clients, and a reduction in individual 1:1 hours. |
| Area 2 - £500k of saving relates to pathway clarification and redesign. There will be a more rigorous enforcement of transfer to other health and social care bodies in line with client choice of residence and need, and greater clarity around preferred pathways for people with learning disabilities requiring residential care and who are older adults with significant care and support needs. |
| Area 3 - The final £50k relates to the extension of charging to people using supported living services, where historical funding streams has meant that people have sat outside of the Council's charging processes |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|---|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| Area 1 -. This will have an impact on individual client choice 'on demand' or sustained as a pattern with a potential reduction in service quality. Approximately two thirds of this saving will impact on in borough service providers, who are generally SME organisations. |
| Area 2 This will reduce in some cases individual client and family choice of service model and provider and increase the risk that there will be reduced understanding and awareness of the impact of learning disability on people's presentation. There will also be a review of all services where there has been significant voids or where the building is |

4. Impact of proposal

not adaptable to meet greater support needs.

Area 3 - The final £100 relates to the extension of charging to people using supported living services, where historical funding streams has meant that people have sat outside of the Council's charging processes. This will directly reduce the amount of disposable income that people have available to them for preferred activities.

All savings which affect any Learning Disability Service providers ability to represent their work as supportive and developmental brings with it an increased risk of de-motivation and burn out of staff which in turn can result in institutional dehumanised practices.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

The ability to achieve this saving will be influenced by demand if demand varies significantly from current forecasts.

The size of the programme, the requirement for consideration of its impact on each individual user to ensure that the authority is acting legally, and the activity related to these processes means there is a resource implication in terms of officer time to be timely and sustain the effort required to deliver social care reviews, contract and fee negotiations, and consultation activity which will need to be managed and specific resources identified, either carved as priorities over other work activity or additional 'invest to save'.

Area 1 relates to direct negotiations with providers about service design and how needs will be met differently. An external organisation has been recruited to help sustain focus on the fee negotiations with out of borough providers. It is a risk that out of borough providers will evict our clients, or encourage families to take legal action against the authority. Officers will assess the risk of family legal action and will work with local providers and other organisations on the Council's service Framework to move quickly where eviction is threatened. A variation to the existing respite service contract will ensure that all clients at risk of eviction are brought 'back to borough' if necessary. In borough providers have signposted a willingness to work in partnership to deliver this saving if the authority will extend existing contract periods to give improved stability to local providers and to also allow them to apply their management activity to the service rather than procurement activity. Officers will be seeking formal approval from Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) to this approach in the autumn.

Area 2 requires a programme of reassessments and reviews, and individual client and family consultation. It will also require a formal consultation process regarding the authority's preferred pathways for service delivery and may also require the closure of some services and support for people to move to alternative services, including the involvement of Independent Mental Capacity Advisors. Particular attention will need to be paid to ensure that the authority is acting lawfully. There will need to be a specific targeted recruitment and training for 'shared lives' carers to support pathway changes, and preparatory work with Extra Care and generic residential providers so that they can properly support the LD overlay. Officers will need to be fully briefed on the new preferred pathways once adopted and ensure that they are presented positively to people and their families. Officers will be seeking formal approval from Mayor and Cabinet to consult on these proposals in the autumn.

Area 3 requires Mayor and Cabinet to agree to consult with those individual affected by the extension of charging. The authority will need to ensure that there is advocacy support for all affected individuals. There will be a specific resource implication for finance officers who will need to be involved in the public consultation process and who will have to undertake financial assessments for 150 plus people. Officers will also organise 'master classes' form provider manager so that they can also support consultation and understanding of the process.

Each area carries its own specific risks. However, there is a potential cross over between all three areas for people who are living in borough who may be affected by the reduction in service activity, pathway redesign and the extension of the charging policy which officers will need to be particularly mindful of.

This is a significant savings target relating mainly to direct service provision. It will potentially result in, or be perceived to result in, a reduction in service quality and client and family choice, both of which have potential reputational risks for the authority.

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | |
| H. | | J. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Negative | | Positive | | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| High | | | | Low | |

| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | High | | | | |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|--|------|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | Medium | |
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | High | | |
| Disability: | High | | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

The savings relate to one specific group of people with disabilities, people with a learning disability. There is no specific mitigating steps that can be taken on this point.

Specific micro groups within that disability category will be more affected by these proposals than others.

People with complex learning and multiple other disabilities will feature as among some of the highest cost packages and their quality of life is directly affected by the staff support available to them to participate in, and understand and influence the environment around them which may be affected by the saving required. The savings negotiations will ensure that complex personal care needs are fully considered and that providers can evidence a programme of activities that people can still participate in, even if less regularly or less fully than currently. Services for people with severe and significant behavioural challenges will be quality assured to minimise risk of resultant placement breakdown.

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

The pathway design for older people with a learning disability will be to generic Extra Care and residential and nursing homes while learning disability may still be the predominant characteristic of need rather than age. There is a risk, therefore, that their levels of daily living and also social skills may deteriorate faster than is currently the case. This may also particularly affect the LD population who were Lewisham's responsibility in long stay hospitals, and who represent an older cohort within the LD population. Consideration will be given to matching the ceiling cost of residential and nursing care with existing service costs as an alternative, and strengthening the awareness and competence of local generic older adult providers to support people with learning disabilities.

The local services into which young people in transition may move will potentially have a greater focus on a maintenance and safety agenda than a full focus on independence and skills agenda. A more coherent approach to transition planning and expectation management will need to be developed to more smoothly manage the education/ care links.

The majority of younger people in transition most likely to be affected by these savings, which predominantly represent savings to the cost of 24 hour supported living and residential care services in and out of borough, directly and indirectly are young men from African and African-Caribbean backgrounds.

Is a full equalities analysis assessment required?

Yes

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

There is an absolute duty upon Local Authorities to assess individuals for possible care and support needs. However, Local Authorities do have a high level of discretion as to how to meet assessed eligible needs, both in the application of approved eligible needs criteria and in terms of the reasonable application of resources. They can charge for social care services. However, on an individual basis, no service user may have their care package altered without a further assessment of need. Statutory consultation is required in relation to the second proposal consultation in relation to the third proposal.

Is staff consultation required (Y/N)

No

Is public consultation required (Y/N)?

Yes

7. Human Resources

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?

No

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

***(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim**

**** (covered by council employee)**

***** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state**

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |

7. Human Resources

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | | |

A3: Changes to sensory services provision

| Changes to Sensory Services | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Lead officer | Joan Hutton |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing and Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A3 |
| Short summary of proposal | Reconfiguring Adult Social Care Sensory Services |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: £2,276.3 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 436 | 0 | 436 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|-----------------------|-----|
| 2015/16 | 2016/17: | 2017/18 | Total 2015/16-2017/18 | |
| 150 | 0 | 0 | 150 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA |
| | | | No | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| N/A | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| Sensory services are provided by the local authority for people with Visual impairment, Hearing impairment and dual sensory loss. The services are currently dispersed across the adult social care assessment and care management teams. |
| The majority of referrals are dealt with by providing information, advice and guidance, the provision of specialist equipment, rehabilitation and specialist guide/communication. |
| The statutory social work element of the service works with service users who often have a sensory impairment as well as mental health issues or learning disabilities, and with young people in transition to adult services. |
| Saving proposal description |
| This proposal is to review all the above service delivery models and explore more cost effective options that will improve access to information, advice and specialist reablement or targeted support, and reduce the need for statutory services. |
| The new service delivery will optimize the use of individualized solutions and the use of personal budgets. |
| Some specialist functions will be commissioned from the external provider market and through cross borough arrangements. |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| The changes proposed will impact on staffing levels. Staff and service users will be fully engaged with the process of |

4. Impact of proposal

change so there is confidence in new service delivery models.

The opportunity to develop new approaches with other boroughs, voluntary/private sector partnering will be based on new outcome focused specification co-produced by service users.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Market testing has taken place and tendering will be required to support some externalisation. The service will then be able to demonstrate evidence of a “ person centred approach “ that promotes choice and control for service users. The service will actively promote service user involvement in service development.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|---------|--|--------|--|--|
| H. | | J. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Neutral | Positive | | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Low | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | | |
|---|--|--|--------|--|--|--|

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | | Medium | |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|---|--|--------|--------------|
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | YES | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|

| 6. Legal |
|---|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal |
| The general employment legal implications will apply and the Council's Management of Change Guidelines. These proposals are being worked up and any outsourcing or changes of the service will need to be subject to an EAA assessment. |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|-----|

| 7. Human Resources | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|--|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | | Yes | |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | | |
| <small>*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim ** (covered by council employee) *** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state</small> | | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | | |
| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 – 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC | |
| FTE | | | | 4 | 1 | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | 3 | | | | |

7. Human Resources

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Vacant** | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: 1 | | | Male: 1 | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 1 | White: X | Other: 1 | Not Known: 3 | | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: N/K | | | Not Known: N/K | | | |

A4: Remodelling building based day services

| Remodelling Building Based Day Services | |
|---|---|
| Lead officer | Joan Hutton/ Dee Carlin |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing and Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A4 |
| Short summary of proposal | Remodelling and rationalising current building based day services and associated transport costs. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: £4,328.7 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 5,332.8 | (1,004.1) | 4,328.7 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | |
| 1,300 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA |
| | | | | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| <p>Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed</p> <p>A review of all in house service provision is required to meet statutory requirements to increase the use of direct payments and develop the external market, as council provided services cannot be purchased via a Direct payment.</p> <p>Day centre provision is often used to meet the needs of vulnerable people who are at risk of isolation, to develop life skills and to provide meaningful activities. There are four centres within the borough, provided by in-house services. They are the Leemore centre, Narborough Centre, Ladywell and Mulberry.</p> <p>Additional services have been developed within the external provider market and with the voluntary sector. This proposal is to remodel the in-house service so that opportunities are offered to customers in smaller community based groups. As outlined in other proposals, service users will be actively encouraged to make greater use of existing community, leisure and educational facilities and social venues in and outside of the borough. Partnership work with external providers will be further developed to make more creative use of centres and reduce the need for the existing number. In addition, the equitable application of resources through the use of the Resource Allocation System is expected to reduce the demand for in house day services.</p> <p>The new model for day opportunities will need to ensure that there continues to be facilities that can provide support to carers, particularly for service users who have high dependency needs.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the promotion of self directed support, travel and life skill training will reduce the reliance on in house transport for some individuals, particularly those currently being transported to in house day services.</p> <p>There will need to be a joint approach with customer services to reduce the adult social care expenditure on transport service which is currently £3m. We are projecting a substantial saving, further financial modelling will be required to quantify this saving exactly.</p> |
| Saving proposal description |

3. Description of service and proposal

The proposal is to consolidate the use of the building based day centres and to release some of the associated transport costs. Support plans for existing Service users will consider a wider range of options to meet their needs thereby giving them more choice and control. .

A review of staffing will be undertaken to reduce expenditure as day service provision is consolidated and transport requirements are reduced.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Consultation will be required with staff, service users and carers. The service has high numbers of agency workers which will be reduced.

Changes to service users' support plans will only take place once a statutory review of needs is undertaken .

Reducing the need for transport to in house day services will need a joint approach with Customer Services as there is likely to be an impact on the Council's D2D services.

Service users and carers will need to be engaged and consulted on any changes to the way their assessed needs are met.

An EAA will need to be completed to look at the impact of changes on Service Users and staff.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Consultation will be needed with both Services Users carers and Staff. Consultation may need to be extensive and all actions may not be completed by end March 2014.

Market testing has taken place and tendering will be required to support externalisation of some service provision.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | Corporate Priorities:- | |
|--|---------|--|--------|--|--|
| H. | | J. | | A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Neutral | Positive | | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Low | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | | |

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|------|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Medium | |
| Age: | | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | High | | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

Service users will have choice and control in the development of their support plans to meet their eligible needs within their personal budget. However any change to a package of care following an assessment or review, may cause stress to the service user. However eligible users will continue to receive support from care management staff and will be supported to make the transition to their new plan.

| | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

Changes to service users' support plans will only take place once a statutory review of needs is undertaken. EAA assessments will be required.

Changes to transport services will require consultation.

In relation to any potential reorganisation of staff, the general employment legal implications will apply and the Council's Management of Change Guidelines.

A full Report will be required.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|-----|

7. Human Resources

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Yes |
|---|-----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – | JNC |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----|
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----|

7. Human Resources

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|
| | | | | | | SMG3 | |
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | |
| Disability: | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | |

A5: Charging for Adult Social Care services

| Charging for Adult Social Care Services | |
|---|---|
| Lead officer | Joan Hutton/ Dee Carlin |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing and Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A5 |
| Short summary of proposal | Charging for adult social care services |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: (2,522.4) | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 0 | (2,522.4) | (2,522.4) |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | |
| 275 | 0 | 0 | 275 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA |
| | | | | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| N/A | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>The Council provides a range of services to adults with social care needs.</p> <p>The council has a discretionary power to levy charges (or contributions) towards the costs of Adult Non-Residential Care services, such as home care and day care. Charges for adult social care must be in line with the Government's "Fair Access to Care Service" national guidance.</p> |
| Saving proposal description |
| <p>Subject to the Mayor's agreement, officers propose to consult on a number of proposals to increase charges for non-residential adult social care. These proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the current income support buffer from 35% to 25%. Government guidance ensures that charges do not reduce any user's income below basic Income Support levels or the Guarantee Credit element of Pension Credit plus a buffer of 25% and Lewisham is unusual in allowing a higher income buffer (35%). We will consult on reducing this to 25% with an estimated increase in income in 2015/16 of £200k. This will bring an estimated 300 service users into charging. Removing the maximum charge for non-residential services (currently £500 p.w.). This will affect approx 20 service users and will generate additional income of approx £75k p.a. Removing any exceptions from charging which are discretionary such as respite and services in supported accommodation. <p>We will also consult known self funders over the introduction of a charge for administration of the Care Account, which is a new requirement of the Care Act.</p> |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| If, following consultation, the proposed amendments to the charging policy are agreed, the changes will affect any |

4. Impact of proposal

service user who, in line with the amended charging policy, is deemed to have the financial means to contribute to the cost of their care.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

If, following consultation, changes to the charging policy are agreed, each service users must be reassessed against the new thresholds before the increased charges can be applied.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|----------|--|--|--|--|
| H. | | | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| High | | 0 | | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact on equalities? | High | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|------|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | High | | |
| Age: | High | | |
| Disability: | High | | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

The users of these services are vulnerable adults, usually on low incomes. Any increase in charges will reduce the disposable income of some clients although the buffer of 25% will continue to provide a level of protection to those on the lowest incomes.

| | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

Section 17 of the Health and Social Services and Social Security Adjudications Act 1983 (HASSASSA Act 1983) gives Local Authorities a discretionary power to charge adult recipients of non-residential services provided such charges are reasonable and they have regard to the Government's "Fair Access to Care Service" national guidance. Formal consultation will be required including consultation with self funders over the introduction of a charge for administration of the Care Account, which is a new requirement of the Care Act 2014.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|-----|

7. Human Resources

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | No |
|---|--|----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | | |

A6: Public Health programme review (I)

| Public Health Programme Review | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Lead officer | Danny Ruta |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Customer , CYP |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing & Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A6 |
| Short summary of proposal | Public Health Programme Review |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget:: 0 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 14,995 | (14,995) | 0 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| <p>Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed</p> <p>Public Health have reviewed the programmes it funds to identify those areas of current public health spend where efficiencies can be achieved with no or minimal impact on the delivery of public health outcomes.</p> <p>The programmes which have been reviewed include the following: Dental Public Health; Health Inequalities; Mental Health; Health Protection; Maternal and Child Health; NHS Health Checks ,Obesity;/Physical Activity- Public Health Advice; Sexual Health.; Smoking and Tobacco Control; Training and Education.</p> <p>The Public Health Budget is ring fenced until the end of 15/16 and must be spent in a way which meets the Council's statutory responsibilities for public health. The Council is required to file annual accounts to Public Health England on how the council's public health allocation is spent against pre-determined spending categories.</p> <p>The overall approach taken has been to first identify those areas of current public health spend where efficiencies can be achieved with no or minimal impact on the delivery of public health outcomes. The £1.5M will be re-invested in services with clear public health outcomes.</p> |
| <p>Saving proposal description</p> <p>Following a review of the public health contracts and commissioned services as set out below £1.5M has been identified for use from the public health budget. This funding is available through a combination of decommissioning some current provision, reducing budgets and efficiencies released through reviewing current contracts prior to 2015/16. This funding will be used to reinvest in other areas of activity with a public health outcome.</p> |

3. Description of service and proposal

| Programme Area | Saving | Savings Proposal |
|--|-------------------|---|
| Sexual Health | £275,600 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-negotiation of costs for Sexually Transmitted Infection testing with Lewisham and Greenwich Trust (LGT) 2. Application of 1.5% deflator to the contract value with LGT as efficiency saving 3. Reduction of 30% in the sexual health promotion budget |
| NHS Health checks | £117,800 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removing Health checks facilitator post 2. Pre- diabetes intervention will not be rolled out 3. Reduced budget for blood tests due to lower take up for health checks than previously assumed 4. Reducing GP advisor time to the programme |
| Health Protection | £12,500 | Stopping recall letter for childhood immunisations |
| Maternal and Child Health | £30,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing sessional funding commitment for Designated Consultant for Child Death Review 2. Removal of budget for school nursing input into TNG |
| Public health advice | £19,200 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decommissioning diabetes and cancer GP champion posts. |
| Obesity/Physical Activity | £92,400 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decommission Hoops4health (£27,400) 2. Changing delivery of Let's Get Moving GP & Community physical activity training (£5,000) 3. Cardiac rehab exercise instructors (£10,000) 4. Decommission Physical Activity in Primary Schools (£50,000) |
| Smoking and Tobacco Control | £20,000 | Decommission Cut Films work in schools with young people to prevent uptake of smoking |
| Dental Public Health | £24,500 | Saving based on underspend |
| Mental Health/Wellbeing | £25,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decommissioning project to support people with Mental health problems to access CEL courses 2. Withdraw funding for clinical input to Sydenham Gardens |
| Health improvement training Programme/ library service | £38,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decommission Health Promotion library service 2. Reduce budget for health improvement training |
| Health Inequalities | £266,500 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reconfiguring Health Access services to deliver efficiencies (£21,500) 2. Remove separate public health funding stream to VAL (£28,000) 3. Decommissioning Vietnamese Health Project (£29,000) 4. Reducing funding for Area Based Programmes (£40,000) 5. Decommissioning CAB Money Advice in 12 GP surgeries (£148,000) |
| TOTAL | £921,500 | |
| Uplift | £547,000 | This money has not been allocated to programmes in anticipation of required savings. |
| Unallocated | £31,500 | |
| Final Total | £1,500,000 | |

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Sexual Health: there is a risk that the reduction in contract value for sexual health, and review of lab screening costs

4. Impact of proposal

will make it difficult for the current provider to maintain the level of access for sexual health services. However, it is anticipated that new ways of delivering the services for example through online testing could help to deliver these savings. There is reasonable evidence that current charges for laboratory activity do not reflect changes in contracting arrangements and should be reduced. On this basis it is anticipated that the impact of the saving proposed on service delivery will be minimal.

NHS Health checks Programme: the indicative saving from this programme comes from not implementing the roll out of an intervention for people identified as “pre-diabetic” as part of the NHS Health check programme. Current levels of uptake for Health checks require a smaller budget than previously assumed. The NHS Health check facilitator role has been removed and the GP support to the programme could be reduced to make the proposed saving with minimal impact on the programme.

Health Protection: it is likely that stopping the sending of reminders for childhood immunisations centrally will have a minimal impact as GPs also tend to contact parents to remind them about immunisations.

Maternal and Child Health : The work of the Designated Consultant for Child Death Review is currently being considered; there is clear scope for a reduction of the funding of this post of about one third as the sessional commitment is lower than is currently being paid for. School Nursing input to TNG (youth provision in Sydenham) will be considered within the priorities for the whole of the School Age Nursing Service contract, and will not be funded separately in future.

Public Health Advice: The advice provided by GPs to Public health for diabetes and cancer has been proposed as a saving. GPs are paid for this support on a sessional basis and not employed by public health. The cancer post has already been decommissioned as the post holder has moved. There has been a discussion with the CCG regarding them picking up the funding for the diabetes post.

Obesity/ physical activity: Two physical activity programmes commissioned by public health for delivery in schools are being decommissioned (Hoops4Health from 2015/16) and Fitness for Life (decommissioned from 2014/15). Schools now have access to a physical activity premium and it is anticipated that they will continue to commission these programmes directly using the premium. Fifteen schools have already opted to do this (there were 5 in the Fitness for Life pilot). A reconfiguration of the Let’s Get moving programme and community physical activity will release an efficiency saving of £5,000. The cost of cardiac rehabilitation previously identified separately is covered by the community services contract with Lewisham and Greenwich Trust so this budget is not required.

Smoking and Tobacco Control: Reducing the budget for working with young people and raising the awareness of the risks of smoking may impact negatively on the prevalence of smoking in the future and on individual’s risk of disease.

Dental Public Health: Whilst some funding has been retained to support delivery of dental health promotion in the borough there is a risk this will be inadequate. In the last year there has been minimal activity in relation to dental public health and reducing this budget reflects this.

Mental Health/Wellbeing: A project which supported people with mental health difficulties to access CEL arts courses was decommissioned in June 2014. This was due to concerns about how the project linked to other services and governance and supervision of the delivery of that support. The impact of this change is minimal as a voluntary sector service recently commissioned by Lewisham CCG offers similar support for this client group.

It is proposed to withdraw funding for the GP clinical support to Sydenham Gardens. Sydenham Gardens accesses the LBL grants programme and could apply for funding through this route.

Health Improvement Training/health promotion library services: Access to library services is now available to health

4. Impact of proposal

improvement staff through their NHS employment so this will be decommissioned from 2015/16. There is an under spend against health improvement training budget and giving this is up as a saving is not anticipated to have a negative impact.

Health Inequalities: A number of organisations are funded to work with communities to reduce health inequalities. This includes supporting people from migrant communities to access health services more effectively. A review of this provision combined with a change in the specification for the Lewisham Refugee and Migrant Network and Community Health Improvement Service to deliver some of this provision will enable savings to be made from this budget area. The Public Health Contribution to the VAL Health Inequalities and Social Care Officer is included in these proposals. VAL will be funded through a single funding stream from the general grants programme.

The Citizens Advice Bureau currently provide benefits advice in 12 GP practices. This provision will be decommissioned. Citizens Advice will be provided across the 4 neighbourhoods to ensure access to money advice continues. There is a risk that reducing funding to some of these organisations will destabilise them financially and have a negative impact on the populations they support. Affected organisations include: **Forvil; Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) and Voluntary Action Lewisham (VAL)**. Consultation will be undertaken with these organisations.

Unallocated: There is a small amount of unallocated money in the public health budget as a result of a previous uplift to the allocation at the point of transition from the NHS.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

The risks associated with the savings identified are minimal. Part of the public health review included ensuring that where possible any decommissioned services which would have an adverse impact on public health outcomes can be delivered through alternative funding or commissioning arrangements.

The main risk areas identified are:

| Programmes | Risk | Mitigation |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Sexual health | LGT reject decrease in funding and saving cannot be made. | Negotiations currently underway to assess financial risk to provider and commissioner. These will be |
| Physical Activity | Schools chose not to fund physical activity programmes | DPH will work with schools to encourage engagement in the programmes |
| Health Inequalities | Access to advocacy and money advice is reduced for the most vulnerable in Lewisham Destabilisation of small organisations | The developing Neighbourhood AICP model will include information and advice as a key component of the model. Work with these providers to support them to access alternative funding streams. |

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|
| I. | | J. | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | |
| | Negative | | Positive | |

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-----|-----------------|--|-----|--|
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
| | | Low | | | Low | |

| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| It is not believed that the savings proposed will have a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic. | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|--|--|--|----|--|

| 6. Legal |
|---|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal |
| Statutory duties for areas of public health were conferred on Local Authorities by the health and Social Care Act 2012. Specifically s 12 of that act introduced a new duty to take appropriate steps to improve the health of people who live in their area. There are regulations requiring Local Authorities to provide particular services for the weighing and measuring of children, provision of health checks for eligible people, open access sexual health services and public health advice to local Clinical Commissioners. |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|--|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes with those organisations who work with communities to reduce health inequalities |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|--|

7. Human Resources

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | No |
|---|--|----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|------------|--------|------------|
| Gender: | Female: | Male: | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | Not Known: | | |

A7: Cost effective care for Mental Health

| Cost Effective Care for Mental Health | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Lead officer | Dee Carlin |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing and Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A7 |
| Short summary of proposal | Mental Health |

| 8. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 7773.6 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 9,192.1 | (1,418.5) | 7,773.6 |

| 9. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|-----------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16 | 2016/17: | 2017/18 | Total 2015/16-2017/18 | | |
| 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 10. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| The Local Authority and CCG currently commission a number of accommodation based services to meet the support needs of those with mental health problems. This includes both block and spot purchased provision. We are currently undertaking a review of all of our accommodation based services to ensure that we have the right level of capacity and support in place to meet the current level of need. We will also be reviewing the cost of current provision to ensure that services are value for money and that we have the right balance of spend between health and social care. We will use care cost modeling tools to ensure that the care costs that we are paying benchmark favorably with the prices paid by other boroughs. This saving will be achieved from the adult social care spend on mental health residential care. |
| Saving proposal description |
| We will achieve the savings by renegotiating those contracts which are arranged on a case by case basis for individual placements to release a higher level of efficiency savings. We will work collaboratively with our neighboring south east London boroughs to develop alternative models of commissioning, including the development of alliance contracts and preferred provider frameworks, to reduce unit costs and to enable us to benchmark any single purchased placements. |

| 11. Impact of proposal |
|---|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| As the main impact will arise from renegotiating contracts with providers to deliver services at a reduced rate, there should be minimal impact on service users. In each case the needs of the service user will continue to be met. |
| Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage |

11. Impact of proposal

these.

Some providers may choose to no longer provide services within a reduced contract level. However the mental health residential market is well developed so it is likely that alternative provision will be available.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--------|--|--|---------|--|
| J. | | H. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | | Neutral | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | | Low | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

12. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|----|--|

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 13. Legal | | | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | | | |
| <p>Although there is an absolute duty upon Local Authorities to assess individuals for possible care and support needs, Local Authorities do have a high level of discretion as to how to meet assessed eligible needs, both in the application of approved eligible needs criteria and in terms of the reasonable application of resources. However, on an individual basis, no service user may have their care package altered without a further assessment of need. The assessment of needs will have to comply with the new requirements of the Care Act 2014.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|----|---|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------|
| 14. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | | No |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | |
| <small>*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim ** (covered by council employee) *** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state</small> | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |
| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |
| Workforce Profile Information | | | | | | | |

14. Human Resources

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | |

A8: Public Health programme review (II)

| Public Health Programme Review (II) | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Lead officer | Danny Ruta |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services/ Children & Young People/ Resources & Regeneration |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing & Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A8 |
| Short summary of proposal | A review of Public Health Programmes |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget:: 0 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 14,995 | (14,995) | 0 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|-----------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18 | Total 2015-2018 | | |
| 1,777.2 | 0 | 0 | 1,777.2 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| <p>Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed</p> <p>Public Health has reviewed the programmes it funds to identify those areas of current public health spend where efficiencies can be achieved with no or minimal impact on the delivery of public health outcomes. An initial £1.5M was identified through this review for re-investment in other areas of council spend where disinvestment would have a negative impact on public health outcomes. Achieving the additional disinvestments from the public health budget identified in this paper for further re-allocation will have a direct impact on service delivery of public health programmes. This re-allocation should therefore only be considered if proposed disinvestments in other areas of council spend would have a greater negative public health impact.</p> <p>The Public Health Budget is ring fenced until at least the end of 15/16. The Council is required to file annual accounts to Public Health England on how the Council's public health allocation is spent against pre-determined spending categories linked to public health outcomes and mandatory functions.</p> <p>The programmes where additional Disinvestments are proposed include the following: Dental Public Health; Health Inequalities; Mental Health (adults and children); Health Protection; Maternal and Child Health; NHS Health Checks; Obesity/Physical Activity; Sexual Health.; Smoking and Tobacco Control; Training and Education.</p> <p>Substance misuse services (which are funded from part of the ring fenced budget) have been reviewed separately.</p> |
| <p>Saving proposal description</p> <p>Disinvestments identified here are in addition to the previously identified £1.5M. A further review of the contracts has identified a potential further £1.8M. It should be noted that this will mean that the remaining public health service provision will be almost entirely limited to that which is mandatory under the Health and Social Care Act.</p> |

3. Description of service and proposal

| Public Health Programme Area | Total Budget | Additional Disinvestments | Total Saving (including initial 1.5M) | Additional Disinvestments proposal |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Sexual Health | £7,158,727 | £469,400 | £745,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce contract value of sexual health by a further £350k. This would likely mean closure of at least one sexual health clinic. 2. Stop/reduce supply of HIV tests to GP practices (£25k) 3. Reduce voluntary sector funding for HIV prevention (£20k) 4. Stop funding SE London Sexual Health network (£10.6k) 5. Reduce Sex and relationships funding by half (£20k) 6. Half funding for GP sexual health facilitator (£7.5k) 7. Stop funding chlamydia and gonorrhoea screening in GP practices (£26k) |
| NHS Healthchecks | £551,300 | £40,000 | £157,800 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction in funding available to support IT infrastructure for NHS healthchecks |
| Public Health Advice to CCG | £79,200 | £- | £19,200 | No further saving proposed |
| Obesity/ physical activity | £650,000 | £81,000 | £173,400 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further reduction in funding for community development nutritionist (£30k) 2. Remove funding for obesity/ healthy eating resources (£10K) 3. Withdraw of funding for clinical support to Downham Nutritional Project (£9k) 4. Efficiency savings from child weight management programmes. (£12k) 5. Reduce physical activity for healthchecks programme |
| Dental public health | £64,500 | £20,000 | £44,500 | Release funding from dental public health programmes |
| Mental Health | £93,400 | £34,200 | £59,200 | Further reduce funding available for mental health promotion and wellbeing initiatives (including training) |
| Health Improvement Training | £88,000 | £20,000 | £58,000 | Limit health improvement training offer to those areas which support mandatory public health services. |
| Health inequalities | £1,460,019 | £315,000 | £581,500 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce the contract value for community health improvement service with LGT by limiting service to support mandatory Public health programmes such as NHS Healthchecks only and reduce other health inequalities activity. (£270k) 2. Further reduce funding for area based public health initiatives which are focused on geographical areas of poor health with in the borough. (£20k) 3. Reduce funding for 'warm homes' (£25K) |
| smoking and tobacco control | £860,300 | £328,500 | £348,500 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce contract value for stop smoking service at LGT by £250k (30%) 2. Stop most schools and young people's tobacco awareness programmes 3. Decommission work to stop illegal sales |
| Maternal and child health | £187,677 | £38,400 | £68,400 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce capacity/funding for breast feeding peer support programme & breast feeding |

3. Description of service and proposal

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | | | cafes 2. Reduce capacity for child death review process by reducing sessional commitment of child death liaison nurse. |
| Department efficiencies | £1,938,000 | £230,700 | £262,200 | To be identified but likely to include staff restructure and further review of all internal budgets and any unallocated funds |
| 2014/2015 Uplift (uncommitted) | | | £547,000 | |
| TOTAL | £14,995,000 | £1,777,200* | £3,277,200 | |

* A further £200k has been identified from the drug and alcohol budget and is accounted for in the Crime Reduction Proforma

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Sexual Health: Sexual Health is a mandatory service commissioned by Local Authorities. Currently Sexual health services are provided by GPs and through sexual health clinics, with some limited provision in pharmacies and online. GPs receive payments for sexual health screening. It is proposed to withdraw this payment. Additionally, funding for the GP facilitator who supports local training and practices to develop clinically safe sexual health services would be reduced by half, the SE London Sexual Health network funding would be cut, support for the delivery of sex and relationships education would be reduced by half. There would also be a reduction in funding for HIV prevention targeted at Black African communities. Funding for HIV tests in GP practices would be reduced.

Previously identified Disinvestments would reduce the funding available to the Lewisham and Greenwich Trust to deliver sexual health services. A further cut to the commissioned service would reduce this further. It is likely to result in a closure or significant reduction to access in at least one of the sexual health clinics.

Changes are likely to result in a decrease in GP engagement regarding sexual health, which will put more pressure on clinics. Currently clinics are struggling to manage capacity in their services, frequently turning patients away. A reduction in their funding may well have an adverse impact on access to sexual health services for the most at risk populations including young people. A reduction in HIV prevention funding will impact on the voluntary sector organisations currently providing these services. The SE London Sexual health network is funded by all 6 SE London Boroughs. The network can access funding for education and training on behalf of the borough, particularly for GPs. Losing this function in the longer term will reduce the opportunity for workforce training and development in relation to sexual health which supports alternative models of provision.

NHS Healthchecks Programme: This is a mandatory programme. The initial saving identified from this programme related to not implementing the roll out of diabetes screening as part of the NHS healthcheck, but also assumptions that the targets for activity will not be achieved. There is a target to screen 75% of the healthcheck eligible population. Currently around 40% are screened. Further Disinvestments are predicated on the Local Authority being able to procure a more cost effective IT system for the call/recall of NHS Healthchecks and managing NHS Healthcheck records. It should be noted that an essential component of the NHS Healthchecks programme is delivered through the Community Health Improvement Service. This service is also proposed for a reduction in funding.

Public Health Advice to CCG: No further saving has been identified from this area

Obesity/ physical activity: Disinvestments have been identified previously from decommissioning physical activity programmes for children. It is hoped that schools themselves will continue to fund this activity. Further Disinvestments are identified by removing the budget for obesity resources and reducing funding for community

4. Impact of proposal

development nutrition programmes mainly delivered by the voluntary sector.

As public health provide the vast majority of funding to support the obesity/healthy eating initiatives in the borough withdrawing this funding would remove the opportunity to develop local resources or awareness campaigns to support obesity and health eating work in communities.

Reducing funding available to support physical activity in people identified at high risk of cardio-vascular disease following a Healthcheck would reduce the number of individuals who could access these programmes. This undermines the impact of the programme in supporting the identified "at risk" population to make changes to reduce their risk of CVD.

Dental Public Health: Because of changes to the NHS and to Dental Public Health and the resulting lack of clarity as to which organisation is now responsible for different aspects of this function, nothing from the Public Health Budget has been spent on Dental Public Health Promotion for the past two years. However, reductions in this activity will largely affect children and the impact of this will not be seen in terms of changes to public health indicators for at least another three years as the first important measure is the average number of decayed missing and filled teeth at the age of five. This is one of the few measures of children's health on which Lewisham has done consistently well in the past. Overall a 69% cut to this budget is proposed.

Mental Health/Wellbeing: Initial Disinvestments have been identified through decommissioning a project which supported people with mental health difficulties to access CEL arts courses (this has now been done). Support for this client group is now available through the voluntary sector contract with Lewisham and Bromley Mind. Further Disinvestments are proposed against children's mental health promotion and adult mental health promotion. This resource has been used to deliver mental health awareness training and support to front line staff in public and voluntary sector organisations (including, health, housing, police, youth services), foster carers and supported housing.

Health Improvement Training: A further reduction in the health promotion training budget will deliver a saving. The health improvement training programme is open to all public and voluntary sector workers whose work contributes to public health outcomes. This programme provides essential training for the delivery of public health programmes including Brief intervention training, sexual health training, training to support the healthchecks programme. A much reduced programme of training would be offered by retaining a small proportion of this budget.

Health Inequalities: In addition to Disinvestments identified from decommissioning benefits advice in GP surgeries and reducing the contribution to VAL, a 50% reduction in the funding of the Community Health Improvement Service has been suggested. This would have a major impact on the work on health inequalities throughout the borough, reduce support for various public health programmes, most notably the Healthcheck programme which relies on the service to provide and outreach function and a "Hub" for referrals for high risk patients and access to health trainers to support individuals. It would also make the neighbourhood model of delivery for community development health improvement services extremely challenging to implement. Further Disinvestments would come from reducing warm homes funding and area based health improvement programmes (which have been shown locally to improve health outcomes).

A number of organisations are funded to work with communities to reduce health inequalities. There is a risk that reducing funding to these organisations will destabilise them financially and have a negative impact on the populations they support.

Smoking and Tobacco Control: Further Disinvestments identified by significantly reducing the budget available for the stop smoking service, reducing work with young people to prevent uptake of smoking, reducing funding for work on Smokefree homes and work on illegal sales. These Disinvestments are likely to have a significant impact on the delivery of the SmokeFree future plan and the ability of Lewisham to reduce the prevalence of smoking and ensuing

4. Impact of proposal

impact on health and social care.

Maternal and Child Health : Further Disinvestments identified from these budgets include reducing the support for the delivery of Free vitamin D, reducing funding for breast feeding peer support and breast feeding cafes, reducing funding commitment for the child death review function (although as this is a statutory function aspects of this must remain in place).

Currently 25 breast feeding peer supporters are recruited and trained on an annual basis supported by the breast feeding peer support coordinator. Reducing this support and the funding for the breast feeding cafes would lead to a reduction in the amount of support to breast feeding women in Lewisham and have a potential impact on rates of breast feeding in the borough. It should be noted that the impact of the peer support programme for breast feeding mothers is likely to extend beyond the breast feeding outcomes and support mental health and child development outcomes by supporting new mothers.

The work of the Designated Consultant for Child Death Review is currently being considered; there is scope for a reduction of the funding of this post of about one third and this was included in the first set of proposed Disinvestments from the Public Health budget. A further reduction is included in this paper, which will reduce the sessional commitment of the child death liaison nurse, but this will reduce the development of that can be done to improve support for bereaved parents in the borough.

A budget allocated for additional School Nursing input to flagship “The Next Generation” (TNG) will be considered within the priorities for the whole of the School Nursing contract, and will not be funded separately in future.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

In particular for sexual health any reduction in service accessibility has the potential to have an adverse impact on abortion, teenage pregnancy and STI transmission and treatment rates. Online sexual health services are being developed which should reduce the number of people needing to attend clinics, enabling clinics to focus on their most vulnerable patients, but Disinvestments released from reduced clinic attendances need to be invested in local GP practice services in the short to medium term.

Releasing these Disinvestments will involve decommissioning services currently provided by Lewisham and Greenwich Trust. A minimum notice period of 6 months will need to be served in order to achieve this. In order for the Disinvestments to be realised in 2015/16 this notice will need to be served by 30 September 2014. In effect the implementation of these Disinvestments would reduce income to LGT from LBL by at least £1.5M.

Most public health provision is targeted at the most at risk populations, and is predicated on both primary prevention and secondary prevention of adverse health outcomes. Some of this work can continue to be embedded in other services which access similar populations, but with reduced funding available across the sector it is likely the impact of decommissioning will be felt in other parts of the system.

There is a risk if Disinvestments identified are not spent in line with the requirements of the Public Health Allocation that future allocations may be affected. In addition to this once the Health Premiums are developed an inability to deliver on public health outcomes may have an adverse affect on income which could be available to the borough.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | Secondary Priority | Corporate Priorities:- |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| I. | J. | A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and |

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| High | | | Medium | | |
| involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | | | | | |

| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | High | | | | |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|--|------|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | High | | |
| Gender: | High | | |
| Age: | High | | |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | High | | |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | High | | |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

Public Health Programmes are targeted at those who experience the greatest inequalities in health outcomes. By definition these are often those groups with protected characteristics. For example Heart disease and diabetes are far more prevalent in the Black population, sexually transmitted infections are much more prevalent in young people,

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

certain BME groups and gay and bisexual men. The remaining public health programmes will need to be more narrowly focused on these groups to help mitigate in the reduction of overall programme funding.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | Yes | |
|---|--|--|-----|--|

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

A number of the contracts held in public health require a minimum notice period of 6 months (and 12 months is good practice for the larger value NHS contracts).

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|---|-----|---|-----|

7. Human Resources

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?

Yes

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

***(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim**
**** (covered by council employee)**
***** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state**

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Gender: | Female: xx | Male: xx | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: xx | White: xx | Other: xx | Not Known: xx |
| Disability: | xx | | | |

7. Human Resources

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: xx | Not Known: xx |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|

A9: Review of services to support people to live at home

| Review of services to support people to live at home | |
|--|---|
| Lead officer | Joan Hutton |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing and Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A9 |
| Short summary of proposal | Reconfiguring Enablement, Linkline, floating support and rapid response team. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 7773.6 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 2,610.8 | (770.2) | 1840.6 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|-----------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16 | 2016/17: | 2017/18 | Total 2015/16-2017/18 | | |
| 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| As part of the integration programme we are reviewing all community support services that provide early intervention, prevention and targeted support to help people live at home. These services include Linkline, floating support, rapid response and enablement care following a hospital discharge. |
| Saving proposal description |
| This proposal is to review and integrate the above services so that there is one point of access and to provide them in a more cost effective way. Detailed proposals are being developed as part of the next phase of the integration programme and this will be available in November. |
| 4. Impact of proposal |
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| This saving will be achieved from changes to staffing arrangements and will focus on realigning back office and management functions. Staff consultation will be required. It is not expected to impact on the provision of care and support. |
| Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these. |
| |

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | Secondary Priority | Corporate Priorities:- |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|---|--------|--|--|
| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
| H. | | J. | | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | | Neutral | Positive | | | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | | Low | | Medium | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |

| |
|---|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: |
| |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|----|--|

| |
|---|
| 6. Legal |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal |
| The general employment legal implications will apply and the Council’s Management of Change Guidelines. These proposals are being worked up and any outsourcing or changes of the service will need to be subject to an EAA assessment. |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|-----|---|----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| 7. Human Resources | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Yes |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | |
| <p>*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim **(covered by council employee) ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state</p> <p>(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)</p> | |

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | 3 | 62 | 21 | 5 | 1 | | |
| Vacant* | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Vacant** | | 4 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Vacant*** | 1 | 22 | 2 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Workforce Profile Information | | | | |
| Gender: | Female: 1 | | Male: 1 | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 41 | White: | Other: 1 | Not Known: 3 |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: 5 | |

A10: Proposal in respect of recouping health costs

| Proposal in respect of recouping health costs | |
|---|--|
| Lead officer | Joan Hutton |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing and Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | A10 |
| Short summary of proposal | Recoupment from Lewisham CCG of the costs of health-related elements of care packages and placements |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 49,826.5 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 34,725.4 | (3,375.4) | 31,350 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|-----------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16 | 2016/17: | 2017/18 | Total 2015/16-2017/18 | | |
| 600 | 0 | 0 | 600 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>People become eligible for fully funded NHS health care when they are assessed as having a primary health need based on the intensity, nature, complexity and predictability of their condition. There will inevitably be a group of service users who needs fall just below the eligibility threshold for receiving fully heath funded continuing care.</p> <p>Adult Social Care has seen a significant increase in the number of clients who, in addition to their social care needs, have complex on going health needs. This increase has been in both in older adults and adults with a physical disability.</p> <p>Whilst these service users do not meet the eligibility criteria for Fully Funded NHS care, it is clear that their health needs are significant, and include support with managing medication.</p> |
| Saving proposal description |
| <p>In accordance with the Department of Health practice guidelines that promote joint funding arrangements between the CCG and the Local authority. Adult social care will work with Lewisham CCG to develop a joint funding agreement to ensure that adequate funding is made available from the CCG to meet the healthcare/nursing elements of care packages for those with more complex needs.</p> <p>The joint funding proposal will transfer additional healthcare/nursing costs to the CCG reducing the financial burden on adult social care.</p> |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| The proposal will not have any impact on any of those in receipt of services as their eligible care need will continue to |

4. Impact of proposal

be met.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

There is a risk that the CCG will not consider this transfer of responsibility affordable the joint funding agreement will need to be supported by both organisations

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|---------|--|----------|--|--|
| J. | | H. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Neutral | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Low | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|----|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| 6. Legal | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| | |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|----|---|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|----|
| 7. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | | No |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | |
| <small>*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim ** (covered by council employee) *** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state</small> | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Workforce Profile Information | | |
| Gender: | Female: | Male: |

7. Human Resources

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | |

Appendix 1 Section B - Supporting People

An introduction providing additional context to the approach taken to preparing the smarter and deeper integration of social care and health, public health and supporting people proposals is provided at Appendix 2 to this report.

B1: Reduction & remodelling of Supporting People housing & floating support services

| Reduction and Remodelling of Supporting People Housing and Floating Support Services | |
|---|--|
| Lead officer | Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Service, Customer services, CYP |
| Portfolio | Health, Wellbeing & Older People |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | B1 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p>The savings across supported housing and floating support services will be achieved through a variety of methods including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity • Reductions in service capacity • Service closures • A review of mental health services across the board lends itself to changes in what is currently commissioned via the SP programme. <p>This will involve a range of decommissioning/ re-commissioning/ closing units and identifying different provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A complete reconfiguration and re-procurement of all remaining floating support services. This will mean that there is no longer any specialist floating support services funded through SP but one generic service that would response to low level needs for older people, those with learning disabilities, single adults and young people. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 12,792 | | |
| Prevention and Inclusion: 8,927 | | |
| Adults with Learning Disabilities: 3,865 | | |
| Expenditure£000's | Income£000's | Net Budget£000's |
| 12,792 | £0 | 12,792 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 | 2,523 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>This paper covers the review of all housing related support activities</p> <p>LB Lewisham has held the responsibility for commissioning housing related support since April 2003 when the Supporting People (SP) programme brought together seven different central government funding streams and devolved them to local authorities. SP funding was ring-fenced to fund housing related support services for vulnerable adults, including homeless people.</p> <p>In Lewisham, housing-related support is delivered by a number of service providers to clients with a range of needs.</p> |

3. Description of service and proposal

Support takes place across different accommodation settings: high-support hostels, shared supported housing and in the community via floating support. As well as funding a number of schemes providing generic support for vulnerable adults such as sheltered housing Lewisham runs specialist projects for individual client groups, such as drug and alcohol users, women experiencing violence and exploitation, offenders and rough sleepers.

Saving proposal description

The savings in this area will be achieved through a variety of methods including:

- Efficiency savings through reduced contract values while maintaining capacity
- Reductions in service capacity
- Service closures

A detailed breakdown of the services involved and the impact is listed below:

Older People with Support Needs :

- LBL Sheltered,
- Greenwich Telecare
- Abbeyfield Deptford
- Anchor Trust Tony Law House
- Anchor Trust Knights Court

People with Learning Disabilities:

- Look Ahead Floating Support

Single Homeless with Support Needs

- Thames Reach Lewisham Reach
- Thames Reach Lewisham Reach - Hostel Diversion
- Thames Reach Lewisham Reach - Hostel Diversion (PbR)
- Thames Reach Lewisham Supported Housing
- St. Mungo's Homelessness services

Offenders/People at Risk of Offending

- Hestia

Young People at Risk

- Centrepoint Young People's Assessment Centre Service
- Single Homeless Project - Tandem Support

Frail elderly

- LBL - Very Sheltered Accommodation (Social Care & Health)

People with Mental Health Problems

- One Support -Honor Lea/Floating Support
- Equinox - Mental Health Sydenham Tredown Road
- Quo Vadis Community Group Homes

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

The reduction in funding will lead to a significant reduction in capacity across a range of services. This will mean that individual service users will no longer receive a service in their own homes and some will need to be decanted from accommodation based services. This removal of service will be targeted to ensure that those with most needs will still receive interventions but ultimately the threshold for services will have to rise.

Sp funded services are generally preventative services and this reduction of capacity may well impact on higher level

4. Impact of proposal

services such as residential care. However, the exact level of this impact is difficult to quantify as individuals will react differently to the withdrawal of services with some coping well and other deteriorating.

The vast majority of the funding reductions will be passed to the voluntary sector as they hold contracts to deliver the frontline provision.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

| Risk | Detail |
|--|---|
| 1. Households becoming homeless | <p><i>Any losses to the floating support service will carry increased risk of more households becoming homeless</i></p> <p>This is because floating support services work with people to mitigate the impact of welfare reform, rent arrears, debt, anti-social behaviour, landlord action etc. A significant number of these will be people that will call upon the council's statutory obligations and require housing in expensive temporary accommodation.</p> <p>It is likely that a significant number of single people presenting as having lost their accommodation would be found intentionally homeless due to rent arrears, anti-social behaviour etc. If not accepted by the council they would still be homeless leading to likely increases in "sofa surfing" and street homelessness.</p> <p>The impact of this will be mitigated by targeting the remaining services at those most in need. This will require close working with colleagues in housing and other frontline services to identify need.</p> |
| 2. Impact on statutory services/temporary accommodation/residential care | <p><i>Loss of hostel bed spaces will inevitably lead to pressure elsewhere within council resources.</i></p> <p>The impact on demand for statutory temporary accommodation, residential care placements and community safety resources is likely to be high. All clients in Lewisham hostels and supported housing have been assessed as having a local housing connection with Lewisham. Any clients found not to have this connection are reconnected to their borough of origin or the No Second Night Out project for resettlement.</p> <p>In high support 24 hour schemes a significant proportion of the residents are already known to statutory services and in receipt of care packages in order to support them to stay out of residential care services. A further and potentially more significant cohort is able to maintain tenancies due to the intensive support they receive to do so. Failure to provide this support could result in many hostel residents support needs increasing to the point where they will require costly interventions involving hospital stays and access to residential care placements.</p> <p>The vulnerable adults pathway will provide step down accommodation from front line hostels allowing enough throughput for those with the most complex needs to continue to access high level support for longer periods in</p> |

4. Impact of proposal

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>order to stabilise their physical health and chaotic behaviour preparing them for a more independent lifestyle. Without this step down frontline hostels will simply become “silted up” with increased cohorts of high support clients, a major risk to clients, staff and local communities.</p> |
| <p>3. Increased risk of safeguarding cases and services failure</p> | <p><i>Further reductions in funding my impact on staff quality and morale to such an extent that service users are put at risk</i></p> <p>Significant savings have already been achieved from services budget by reshaping and consolidation of existing services, some closures and competitively tendering through the Four Borough Framework.</p> <p>Some of these savings have been achieved through management efficiencies and consolidating contracts but also, increasingly, through the reduction in the wages and conditions of front line staff.</p> <p>Further erosion of these conditions is likely to reduce the quality of the workforce, decrease morale and increase staff turn-over all of which carry the risk that the services become unsafe and safeguarding issues increase.</p> |
| <p>4. Increased use of existing hostels by high needs out of borough clients</p> | <p><i>The loss of buildings currently used as hostel accommodation is in itself a significant one.</i></p> <p>Finding premises to use as hostel accommodation is notoriously difficult due to several factors, most notably, size and suitability of the accommodation, neighbourhood objections and the capital implications in bringing a building up to suitable living standards. Any hostels that are decommissioned are likely to be disposed of by Registered Providers as there would be no viable alternative for their use.</p> <p>There is a further risk to be considered regarding the use of some existing hostel buildings. Some building are owned by the providers and at least one has indicated that if the service is decommissioned they will revert back to use as a registered care home or supported living and offer it out as open access spot purchase. Many of these premises operated in this capacity prior to the advent of the Supporting People programme resulting in the import of high needs individuals to the borough impacting on statutory health & social care services, police, community safety resources and neighbourhood complaints. Each closure would need to be considered individually and an independent risk plan drawn up in order to inform elected members and communities.</p> <p>This I already the case within Lewisham with buildings such as Miriam Lodge importing significant need in to the borough.</p> |
| <p>5. A rise in rough sleeping</p> | <p><i>Numbers of people living on the streets in Lewisham will rise significantly</i></p> <p>This is likely if reduced floating support services to help maintain tenancies</p> |

4. Impact of proposal

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>and few hostel bed spaces for people to access. This will result in increased call on social care, health, police and community safety resources as well as the increased health risk to the individuals concerned.</p> <p>The Street Rescue outreach team, funded by the GLA, are a vital component in the enforcement and support process for all rough sleepers. However, Street Rescue are already seeing an increase in the number of rough sleepers in the borough with 82 unique individuals found sleeping rough in the borough in the last 6 months.</p> <p>Escalating numbers of rough sleepers will see a rise in emergency hospital admissions and without suitable capacity within supported housing/hostel provision there will be a call on statutory housing or care services upon discharge. The risk of deaths on the street due to increasing numbers and lack of provision will need to be considered.</p> |
| <p>6. A rise in Anti Social Behaviour on the streets</p> | <p><i>Anti social behaviour on the streets in Lewisham may rise significantly</i></p> <p>Many of the individuals supported by housing related support services have a history of anti-social behaviour including begging, street-drinking and petty theft.</p> <p>The closure of these services is likely to lead to an increase in this type of activity particularly around town centres and other ASB 'hotspots'.</p> |
| <p>7. Financial Viability</p> | <p><i>Remaining services become financially unsustainable for providers and they withdraw from provision.</i></p> <p>A high level of savings has already been achieved from the homelessness budget by reshaping and consolidation of existing services, some closures and competitively tendering through the Four Borough Framework. It is believed that services are close to the point where further significant reductions in costs will make the services no longer financially viable for providers to run.</p> |

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--|--|----------|--|--|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness |
| H. | | | I. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | | Medium | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|------------|
| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | and equity |

| | |
|--|---|
| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | | |
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--------|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

The nature of the services see funding reductions (sheltered housing/ extra care for older people, supported housing for people with learning disabilities) mean that the impact on certain groups is likely to be higher than others.

Statutory Consultation will be required for the reductions in relation to :

- LBL Sheltered Accommodation
- Hestia – withdrawal of floating service to those at risk of offending
- Hostel services to those with mental health problems at Equinox and Quo Vadis

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

An EAA assessment will be required and a full Report to Mayor and Cabinet Impact assessments will be undertaken to reduce these impacts as far as possible.

| | | | | |
|---|-----|---------|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | x – for | | |
|---|-----|---------|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | individual reductions rather than overall | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

All services are delivered via contracts which will require decommissioning/ re-commissioning. Reductions. Negotiations

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|-----|

7. Human Resources

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?

No

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim

** (covered by council employee)

*** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|------------|--------|------------|
| Gender: | Female: | Male: | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | Not Known: | | |

Appendix 1 Section E - Asset Rationalisation

E1: Re-organisation of Regeneration & Asset Management division

| Structural re-organisation of the Regeneration & Asset Management Division. | |
|---|--|
| Lead officer | Rob Holmans |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Resource & Regeneration |
| Portfolio | Resources |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts |
| Reference no. | E1 |
| Short summary of proposal | Structural re-organisation of the Regeneration & Asset Management Division |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 17,523 | (5,362) | 12,162 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 600 | 0 | 0 | 600 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| In order for the division to be sustainable and fit-for-purpose looking in to the future, the divisions leadership are working on a root and branch re-structure of the services to ensure it is 'outcomes' focused and capable of delivering significant Regeneration and Investment programs across the borough. |
| Saving proposal description |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing a flexible and future-ready organisational structure. • Retaining core skills and management information, and move further to a commissioning model. • Ensuring that staff are skilled and able to work flexibly across functions. • Moving towards shared processes and systems in order to standardise and streamline functions. • Providing better alignment with other service areas in order that together we can help define and deliver against the authority's corporate priorities. • Develop a 'go to' organisation for assets and the 'built environment'. <p>The £600k identified is a continuation of the £250k identified for delivery in 2014/15, meaning that the re-organisation will save £850k in total, any potential overlap with the Business Support Review which is already underway is being considered and discussed.</p> |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| There will be an overall reduction in the number of posts. Furthermore the new structure and ways of working will involve closer working with other divisions, including |

4. Impact of proposal

planning, housing and CYP. Whilst only minimal direct impact on these services is expected, the transition to an 'outcomes' focused service will impact how this division interacts with the wider organisation.

No significant impact on service users or the voluntary sector.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

- There may be delays in delivery due to the scale of the re-organisation and the number of staff affected, this is being mitigated through close working with HR to ensure that the process is as streamlined as possible
- The Council will be competing for professionally qualified resources in the general market place, the new organisational structure has been designed to attract appropriate resources.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--|--|--|--------|--|--|
| J. | | | E. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | Positive | | | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| High | | | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|
| | | | | | | |

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline

| |
|---|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: |
| what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : |
| N/A |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|

| |
|--|
| 6. Legal |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal |
| N/A |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|-----|---|----|

| |
|---------------------------|
| 7. Human Resources |
|---------------------------|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Yes |
|--|-----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | 8.12 | 5.8 | 25 | 46.2 | 12 | 7.8 | 1 |
| Head Count | 26 | 6 | 25 | 43 | 12 | 5 | 1 |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | 1 | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | 1 | 5 | | 3 | |

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| Workforce Profile Information |
|--------------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Gender: | Female: 59 | Male: 59 | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 30 | White: 84 | Other: 1 | Not Known: 3 |
| Disability: | 17 yes, 101 no | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 33 | | Not Known: 85 | |

E2: Optimisation of operational estate

| Optimisation of Operational Estate | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Lead officer | Rob Holmans |
| Directorates affected by proposal | All (through use of operational estate) |
| Portfolio | Resources |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development |
| Reference no. | E2 |
| Short summary of proposal | Efficiencies in the current facilities management contracts and optimising the current operational estate (reduction in the quantum of office accommodation) to enable the provision of lower cost, fit for purpose buildings that meet service needs. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 17,523 | (5,362) | 12,162 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 190 | 305 | 670 | 1,165 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| The Council must take a critical look at its assets and social infrastructure needs, as current levels of expenditure are unsustainable Project will be delivered in two workstreams: - Efficiencies in the current facilities management contracts - Optimising the current operational estate, which will enable the Council, over time, to provide lower cost, fit for purpose buildings that meet the service needs of the local community |
| Saving proposal description |
| Asset Management arrangements – Reduction in FM contracts for hard and soft services (£240k) Asset Management arrangements – Delivering economies of scale through the procurement of more FM services via a single provider (£100k) Asset Management arrangements – Integration of FM functions (beyond CAS) into single client team (£75k) Asset Optimisation – Reduced size of the operational estate mainly through reduction in quantum of office accommodation (£400k) Asset Optimisation - Increased use of school estate to support community and youth delivery currently met from the operational estate (£250k) Asset Optimisation – Shared use of the operational estate through co-location of services and greater transparency around building use (£100k) |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| Efficiencies in the current facilities management contracts: No significant impact on staff, service users, voluntary sector and other services. |

4. Impact of proposal

Optimising the current operational estate, which will enable the Council, over time, to provide lower cost, fit for purpose buildings that meet the service needs of the local community:

Staff – some impact on staff as they may be re-located to other operational buildings for service delivery.

Service Users – some impact on service users as they may need to access different operational buildings to receive services

Council Services – some impact as they may be co-located with other services and delivered from other operational buildings

Voluntary sector – some impact as they may be co-located with other services from other operational buildings or even transferred to other assets (e.g. Schools). There will be greater transparency with regards to the net cost to Council of these services.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

- dependant on policy decisions, negotiations and variations to the FM contracts will be required.
- FM service delivery standards may be affected
- savings may not be fully realised.
- dependant on internal & external negotiations and allocations of resources and finances.
- It may not be possible to relocate some services into one core building such as Laurence House because of the nature of service provided
- Lease surrender negotiations could prove difficult
- Optimising the use of office space through flexible working or desk sharing may not work in all instances as this is heavily influenced by the nature of service being delivered.
- Potential for duplication of savings with other options as there is significant crossover with for example, extended use of schools and co-location or shared use of operational estate.
- Sensitivities regarding links to the re-profiling of the delivery of Service areas.
- Schools not willing to engage in the process
- Community and youth services not willing to relocate some of their services to school sites (sensitivities around re-shaping service provision generally).
- Building closures through this option would not necessarily result in full savings on the running costs as intensified use of other buildings at some cost would be required.
- There may be some once-off capital expenditure required in some buildings to make them fit for purpose.
- Services or users may not fully engage making any delivery of such an approach difficult
- Changing status of the School estate may impact on Council's ability to utilise School estate

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--|--|--|--------|--|--|
| A. | | | C. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | Positive | | | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| High | | | | Medium | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|--|--|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| N/A | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|

| 6. Legal | |
|--|--|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| <p>The operational estate needs to comply with the asbestos, fire safety, water hygiene and glass legislation, regulations and associated approved codes of practice for the 100 plus buildings that form the corporate estate.</p> <p>This proposal will ensure that the use to the operational estate always meet statutory legislative requirements as the freehold owner of these sites.</p> | |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No* |
| | | | *Note – individual Services may need to consult with regards to the changes in operational building use and the impact on Service Users |

| 7. Human Resources | | |
|--|----|--|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | No | |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | |
| *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim | | |
| **(covered by council employee) | | |

7. Human Resources

*****(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state**

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | | |

E3: Creating income from asset portfolio

| Generating Income From Asset Portfolio | |
|--|--|
| Lead officer | Rob Holmans |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Resource & Regeneration and Customer Services |
| Portfolio | Growth & Regeneration |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development |
| Reference no. | E3 |
| Short summary of proposal (to be included in overall report) | New ways to generate a revenue income from assets. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 17,523 | (5,362) | 12,162 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|---|-----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16 – 2017/18* | |
| | | | *Note – this strand is assumed to generate £5.7m in total by 2021, with £0.2m by 2018 | |
| 0 | 0 | 200 | 200 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA |
| | | | | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| N/A | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>Whilst in the past a number of the Authority's assets have been disposed of to assist development opportunities, generally by generating a one off capital receipt, this programme will investigate ways that assets can be utilised to generate a sustainable long term revenue income. Although not part of this formal project assessment, it should also be noted that in bringing forward such planning and development investment projects, they should contribute to the delivery of the borough's regeneration strategy and further enhance capital and revenue growth.</p> <p>The 'New Income Projects' work strand will contribute towards R & AM's commitment to deliver a new net revenue position of £9m/year by 2021 (£5.7m/year) (although only £200k is deliverable by 2018 due to the requirement to construct assets) and support the delivery of Lewisham's Regeneration Strategy enabling its sustainable growth, linked to current GLA population growth predictions for London. There is the need to pump prime the delivery of this strand and it is anticipated that circa £0.5m will be required per annum for the first 3 years. A capital receipt/s from surplus disposals could be used to fund these works as it is anticipated that they will be eligible for capitalisation.</p> |
| Saving proposal description |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking at new ways to generate a revenue income from assets, rather than previous default position of disposal to assist development opportunities (meaning the Council can also share in transformation £ uplift). Work has started to identify key sites that could be developed as potential PRS sites, hotel provision or student accommodation, instead of/as well as additional housing and school places. Work is also ongoing to research suitable delivery vehicles for these programmes together with some soft market testing amongst potential delivery partners. A smart, 'One Housing programme' approach (that can assist in the delivery of affordable housing as well). |

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Staff – no impact on staff although some temporary resources (including consultancy) will be required for the delivery of this savings proposal
 Service Users – may need to access different operational buildings to receive services if sites are identified as within the scope for this strand
 Voluntary sector – there may be an impact if sites currently used by the VCS are identified as within the scope for this strand
 Other Council Services - may be co-located with other services and delivered from other operational buildings if sites are identified as within the scope for this strand

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Amongst others associated with individual projects:

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

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------|--|--|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
| F. | | | E. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | Positive | | | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| High | | | | Medium | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---------------------|---|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral | Note – the potential impact on the estate is covered in the Optimisation strand |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| N/A | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | NO | Note – the potential impact on the estate is covered in the Optimisation strand if necessary |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|

| 6. Legal | |
|--|--|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| The relevant powers and consents to enable the Council to establish efficient delivery vehicles for each project within this strand will be subject to both internal and external legal due diligence prior to the commencement of the projects. | |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|----|---|----|

| 7. Human Resources | | |
|---|--|----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | No |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE | | |

equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim

** (covered by council employee)

*** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|--------|--------|------------|------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | | |

E4: Improving rent collection for commercial assets

| Improving Rent Collection for Commercial Estate | |
|---|---|
| Lead officer | Rob Holmans |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Resource & Regeneration |
| Portfolio | Growth & Regeneration |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development |
| Reference no. | E4 |
| Short summary of proposal | Generating increased income, based on up-to-date market rates, better use of properties and effective rent collection. Also includes the transfer of commercial assets from the HRA to the GF (linked to Housing Strategy saving) |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 17,523 | (5,362) | 12,162 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | |
| 50 | 445 | 100 | 595 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA |
| | | | | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| N/A | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developing a consistent approach to the use of Council assets – both operational and commercial estates. - Introducing a new Asset Management Plan and AM system / governance arrangements to strengthen the corporate decision-making processes. - Generating increased income, based on up-to-date market rates, better use of properties and effective rent collection - Better alignment of the commercial estate with corporate service delivery priorities. - Driving transparency. <p>NOTE: there is a saving for R&AM within the Housing strand for transferring HRA commercial properties to the GF.</p> |
| Saving proposal description |
| <p>Optimise the Commercial Estate – Increase the 'Commercial' estate through the correct identification of all assets owned. (£200k)</p> <p>Review of Commercial Estate to Increase Market Rentals to Increase Income (£250k)</p> <p>Improvements in the debt recovery of the commercial estate rent roll. (£50k)</p> <p>Optimisation of the transferred HRA non-housing stock (£50k)</p> <p>Optimising the Commercial Estate – moving the Voluntary & Community Sector organisations into more appropriate assets (reduce the opportunity cost of them occupying potentially expensive / valuable retail units) (£25k)</p> <p>Advertising income from both on and off highways. (£20k)</p> |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|---|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| <p>Staff – no impact on staff as they do not operate from the Commercial Estate, the internal restructure of the R&AM service will ensure that staff are able to deliver this saving through the management of the portfolio.</p> <p>Service Users – no impact as Council Services are not delivered from the Commercial Estate</p> |

4. Impact of proposal

Voluntary sector – there may be an impact as the use of the Commercial Estate by the voluntary sector is reviewed to ensure VCS organisations that currently occupy potentially valuable commercial property are moved out of these into units that are more appropriate for their needs; and in so doing reducing the commercial cost burden on these VCS organisations. There will be greater transparency with regards to the net cost to Council of these services.
Other Council Services - no impact as Council Services are not delivered from the Commercial Estate.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

- in relation to either gaining vacant possession and/or putting new commercial leases in place these processes can take a considerable amount of time, some lag has been accounted for and resources will be required to mitigate.
- Rent review process can also be protracted particularly if the matter has to be referred to a third party in accordance with the leases, some lag has been accounted for and resources will be required to mitigate.
- Resistance from lease holders to the introduction of direct debit payments – resulting in a reduced market for commercial properties, this is being tested and is generally being accepted by the marketplace;
- Lack of training for debt collection team results in poor implementation of the direct debit payments process, training is being designed and deployed;
- Inconsistent application of approach to introducing direct debit payments for rentals reduces effectiveness, training is being deployed to mitigate;
- Reputational issues with regards to advertising on or near the highways, mitigated by careful selection of advertising content and formats.
- Planning policy restricts scope of advertising income, close liaison with planning to mitigate where possible.
- May need additional resources to assist with securing possession of the premises and then re-letting to ensure new revenue streams are derived, the re-organisation of R&AM should provide sufficient resource.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--------|--|--------|--|--|
| E. | | J. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | Positive | | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | Note – it is possible that through the review of the VCS | | |
|---|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | sector occupation that some equalities impact will occur | |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|---|--|--------|--|
| Ethnicity: | | Medium | |
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | Medium | |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | Medium | |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | Medium | |
| Sexual Orientation: | | Medium | |
| Gender reassignment | | Medium | |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| N/A | | | |
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | No | |

| 6. Legal | | | |
|---|----|--|----|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | | | |
| <p>All properties owned by Lewisham must be statutorily compliant. These are essential requirements under the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974.</p> <p>Also, from April 2018, the proposed legislative changes would make it unlawful to let residential or commercial properties with an Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) Rating of F or G (i.e. the lowest 2 grades of energy efficiency).</p> <p>Therefore as part of this strand we will ensure that the Commercial Portfolio remains statutorily compliant.</p> <p>A further legal implication that will be addressed is to ensure that all commercial tenants have a suitable and formal tenancy agreement in place and that this complies with S123 of the Local Government Act 1972.</p> <p>With regards to the transfer of non housing assets from the HRA to the GF, Council's opinion is as follows: "In principle, both commercial premises and garages which are let separately from any residential property can be re-appropriated and transferred out of the Council's HRA without the consent of the Secretary of State, on the grounds that they are not a house, part of a house, belonging to a house or enjoyed together with a house. However, the status of each individual property should be verified against those criteria before it is transferred."</p> | | | |
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |

| 7. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | | No |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim **(covered by council employee) ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |
| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – | JNC |

7. Human Resources

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|
| | | | | | | SMG3 | |
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: | |
| Disability: | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | | |

E5: Energy efficient measures

| Energy Efficient Measures | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Lead officer | Rob Holmans |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Resource & Regeneration |
| Portfolio | Resources / Community Safety |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development |
| Reference no. | E5 |
| Short summary of proposal | Energy savings through a saving through the cessation of the of the CRC (Carbon Reduction Commitment) scheme in 15/16 and dimming street lighting from 16/17. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 17,523 | (5,362) | 12,162 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | |
|---|----------|------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | |
| 109 | 10 | 15 | 134 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA Yes |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| L&G, Phoenix & Affinity Sutton are part of the street lighting PFI and if they choose to participate in a dimming programme, they could make some savings, as they currently pay their energy bills | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| The street lighting PFI, also includes a Central Management System (CMS) that allows us to vary the lighting levels, both up and downwards. The British Standard allows for lighting to be lowered by one lighting class. This would reduce our energy consumption and thereby reduce our overall energy bill and our carbon footprint |
| Saving proposal description |
| Energy and utility management from the ending of the requirement on the Council to purchase allowances under CRC (£109k) Energy consumption reduction in street lighting through dimming and trimming (£25k) [Note – an earlier saving for energy generation and supply through the installation of PVs on Council assets (£100k) has been removed due to the upfront capital investment required. The Service is seeking external funding sources and may bring this item back] |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| Staff – no impact. Service Users – possible impact on service users of the highways and footways network from the dimming and trimming of street lighting, whilst lighting levels will always meet British lighting standards, service users may view this initiative both positively and negatively as the Council currently receives complaints that the lighting levels are both too high and too low. An example of a negative impact could be an increase in the fear of crime, an example of a positive impact is where residents have complained that street lighting outside their residences is too bright. An equalities analysis assessment will need to be undertaken as part of the work to develop a policy on the dimming and trimming of street lighting. |

4. Impact of proposal

Voluntary sector – no impact.

Other Council Services - no impact, other than Housing, will need to carry out their own review to ascertain their residents views should they wish to dim their lighting assets.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Cessation of the requirement on the Council to purchase allowances under CRC

- A consultation has now been issued by HMT on the 15/16 local government settlement, which includes proposals to recover the lost income through an adjustment in the settlement
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-finance-settlement-2015-to-2016-technical-consultation>
- For Lewisham this has been calculated at £150,727.

Dimming and Trimming Street Lighting

- Consumption reductions may be offset by tariff increases, resulting in no net cost savings, but would provide a protection against increased tariffs should we not dim.
- A trimming and dimming policy will need to be developed and in conjunction an assessment of impact to address equalities and environmental implications in order to manage any resultant public concerns – achievement of the saving will be dependent on this policy.
- Public concerns regarding the adoption of the policy, around fear of crime and road safety
- Ability to reduce light levels where residents are concerned that lighting level are too high.
- A draft policy will be produced in good time for 16/17, that will be reviewed by Sustainable Development Committee and then approved by M&C. This is likely to involve public consultation, although this will be dependant on any Impact Assessments that are carried out.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--------|--|--|--|--|
| J. | | | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | | |
|---|--|--|--------|--|--|--|

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|--|--|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | Medium | |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact:

The street lighting dimming and trimming proposal may be subject to a form of general public consultation / communications exercise where we would have to set out the facts and the direct and indirect impacts based on an impact analysis which took the environmental and service user impacts into consideration. Until such time as this analysis is completed we are assuming that some of the groups with protected characteristics will be impacted at a medium level. An equalities analysis assessment will need to be undertaken as part of the work to develop a policy on the dimming and trimming of street lighting.

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|

| 6. Legal | |
|--|--|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| N/A | |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|---|----|---|-----|

7. Human Resources

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | No |
|--|--|----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state
 (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

7. Human Resources

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender: | Female: | Male: | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | |

Appendix 1 Section F – Corporate & Business Support Services

F1: Centralisation of business support services

| Centralisation of Business Support Services | |
|---|---|
| Lead Officer | Ralph Wilkinson |
| Directorates Affected By Proposal | All |
| Portfolio | Resources |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts |
| Reference Number | F1 |
| Short Summary Of Proposal | Establishment of a centrally located, corporate business support service which combines a general support function with specialist service hubs |

| 1. Financial Information | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000s) | | | |
| Overall Salary Cost Of Staff In Scope: | | | |
| 4,894 | | | |
| CYP | Community Services | Customer Services | Resources & Regeneration |
| 2,019 | 1,266 | 637 | 972 |

| 2. Value Of Proposals Per Year (£000s) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 900 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,900 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe this impact below: | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description Of Service And Proposal |
|---|
| Description Of The Service, Functions Or Activities Which Are Being Reviewed: |
| <p>All business support and administrative functions undertaken across the organisation were considered within the scope of the review – this included generic office-based and premises support, customer contact (such as dealing with initial enquiries, processing applications, contacts or referrals, maintaining databases and taking payments) and more complex service-based support (including ICT, finance, performance and project-related work).</p> <p>The project team used an iterative approach to determine the final number of posts in scope, which involved a desktop review of HR data, detailed discussions with service managers, completion of job analysis questionnaires and follow-up meetings with Heads of Service.</p> |
| Saving Proposal Description: |
| <p>It is proposed to establish a centralised, corporate business support service which combines a general support function with specialist service hubs.</p> <p>As part of the implementation process, the number of business support posts across all services in scope will be reduced by 20%. This will deliver an in-year saving of at least £900k during 2015/16. It is anticipated that these post reductions can be sustained via economies of scale, basic technical and process redesign and some reduction in non-core business support functions.</p> <p>Once the new service is fully embedded, more comprehensive technical and process redesign will be undertaken in</p> |

order to achieve further savings. It is likely that these changes will take up to a year to implement as they have interdependencies with other key strands of programme activity, so it is proposed to delay the delivery of further savings (in the region of £1m) until 2017/18.

4. Impact Of Proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other Council services:

The establishment of a centralised business support service will:

- Introduce a consistent approach to the level of business support provided across the organisation so that variable needs are met with limited resources in a transparent, strategic manner
- Ensure that the structure is more responsive to the changing shape and requirements of the organisation
- Enable generic functions (such as invoicing, post distribution and document scanning) to be rationalised and streamlined
- Generate efficiencies of scale (in terms of cover for leave and sickness absence)
- Provide a clear career structure for business support staff, with opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge as well as access structured training packages

However, the breadth of business support tasks delivered by the centralised service may be limited and some tasks will no longer be provided or will need to be undertaken in a reduced form.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these:

- The most significant process efficiencies during the first year of operation will only be achieved following the implementation of key technical enablers, such as iProcurement, corporate scanning and workflow solutions – if these projects are not delivered effectively and on time, then the in-year savings for 2015/16 may not be fully realised
 - In order to mitigate this risk, we will need to align such projects with the Customer Transformation review and the delivery of the ICT and Customer Services Strategies, as well as working closely with corporate teams to ensure priorities are understood and the pace of change is maintained
- There is a risk that potential savings may have been overestimated and that some business support posts across the organisation were not identified during the review process – however, this risk is likely to be low given the detailed, robust approach taken to determine the final number of posts in scope and associated savings. In addition, there will be further opportunities to identify and review other business support posts during the implementation process and once the new service is in place

5. Impact On Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | Secondary Priority | Corporate Priorities:- |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| J. | | A. Community Leadership & Empowerment B. Young People’s Achievement |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Impact Of Saving On Corporate Priority | | | Impact Of Saving On Corporate Priority | | | & Involvement C. Clean, Green & Liveable D. Safety, Security & A Visible Presence E. Strengthening The Local Economy F. Decent Homes For All G. Protection Of Children H. Caring For Adults & Older People I. Active, Healthy Citizens J. Inspiring Efficiency, Effectiveness & Equity |
| Positive | | | | | | |
| Level Of Impact | | | Level Of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Ward/Geographical Implications – State Which Specific Wards Are Directly Affected By This Proposal (In Principle Stage) | |
| All Wards: All | If individual wards, please state: |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|
| Service Equalities Impact | | | | | | |
| What Is The Expected Impact On Equalities? | | | | | | Low/Neutral |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|
| Level Of Impact – State The Level Of Impact On The Protected Characteristics Below: | | | |
| Ethnicity | | | Low/Neutral |
| Gender | | | Low/Neutral |
| Age | | | Low/Neutral |
| Disability | | | Low/Neutral |
| Religion Or Belief | | | Low/Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation | | | Low/Neutral |
| Gender Reassignment | | | Low/Neutral |

| |
|---|
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic, please explain why and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact: |
| N/A |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| Is A Full Equalities Analysis Assessment Required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|----|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| 6. Legal | |
| State Any Specific Legal Implications Relating To This Proposal | |
| N/A | |

| | | | |
|--|-----|---|----|
| Is Staff Consultation Required? (Y/N) | Yes | Is Public Consultation Required? (Y/N) | No |
|--|-----|---|----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| 7. Human Resources | |
| Will This Saving Proposal Have An Impact On Employees Within The Team? (Y/N) | Yes |

Within This Saving Proposal, Please State The Number Of Posts In The Current Structure By Grade Band (FTE Equivalent, Headcount & Vacant)

***(not covered by Council employee e.g. interim)**

**** (covered by Council employee)**

***** (including posts covered by agency – if nil, please state)**

| | Scale 1-2 | Scale 3-5 | Scale 6-So2 | Po1-Po5 | Po6-Po8 | SMG1-SMG3 | JNC |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|---------|---------|-----------|-----|
| FTE | 1 | 87.9 | 36 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Headcount | 1 | 89 | 36 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacant* | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 1 | 92 | 37 | 16 | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|---------------|
| GENDER | Female: 111 | | Male: 31 | |
| ETHNICITY | BME: 56 | White: 72 | Other: 0 | Not Known: 14 |
| DISABILITY | Yes: 7 | | No: 122 | Not Known: 13 |
| SEXUAL ORIENTATION | Where Known: | | Not Known: | |

Appendix 1 Section G – Income Generation

G1: Increasing income from services to schools, debt collection & investment strategy

| Increasing Income from Schools SLA, Debt Collection and Investment Strategy | |
|---|--|
| Lead officer | Selwyn Thompson |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Customer Services, Children and Young People, Resources and Regeneration |
| Portfolio | Resources / Children & Young People |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts |
| Reference no. | G1 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p>This proposal covers areas reviewed as sources of income generation for the authority. The review considered approaches to optimise income generation through: changes to our fees and charges structures, reviewing charges to our School SLAs, improving debt collection and reviewing the council's current investment strategy.</p> <p>The consultation report for the blue badge element of this proposal is provided at Appendix 3.</p> |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| | | |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | |
|--|----------|------------|------------------------|------------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | |
| 974 | 0 | 0 | 974 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | Yes | HRA |
| | | | | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| Schools will be using funding from the DSG for service level agreements. | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>Schools SLA Service Level Agreements are offered by the council to schools and cover a variety of support services. Schools pay for these services from their delegated formula budgets.</p> <p>Council Tax Collection – Revenues Service The Revenues Service is responsible for the annual collection of £100m Council Tax, £50m Business Rates, sundry debt and the payments centre. The review is focused on the collection of Council Tax.</p> <p>Investment Strategy – Finance Service The Council's Finance Service provides a statutory accounting function; financial, business and management accounting advice to management; and the associated transactional financial services, such as paying staff and suppliers. The review is focused on the Council's investment strategy.</p> <p>Blue Badge Administration Fee – Benefits Service The Benefit Service is responsible for the payment of £220m Housing Benefit, £28m Council Tax Benefit and concessionary awards (freedom passes, taxi cards and blue badges). Customers are claimants and potential claimants. Stakeholders are the Council, Lewisham Homes, landlords and many 3rd sector claimant support organisations. The review is focused on the administration of blue badges.</p> |
| Saving proposal description |

3. Description of service and proposal

Schools SLA – (£200k)

By increasing the range of charged for services and decreasing the number of “free” services then schools will find that their delegated budgets do not enable the same amount of services to be procured as previously. The following services will be increasing their charges:

- Estate Management Unit – Fire Risk Assessment service. This service is not currently recovering full cost and therefore an increase in prices to recover overheads will be introduced.
- Estate Management Unit – Asbestos management and removal. This involves the audit of asbestos, the maintenance of registers, identifying works and undertaking the removal of encapsulation or removal. Voluntary Aided schools are currently meeting the costs for this service; this proposal would introduce the costs to all schools.
- Mail Delivery Service – The mail delivery service provided to schools is a unique service and one which is not offered across all other boroughs. Currently Lewisham is not recovering the full cost of this service with the current pricing model. This proposal is to increase charges to reduce the current levels of subsidy.

The following areas will be introducing new SLAs available for Schools to purchase:

- Free School Meal Eligibility – The Local Authority currently provides a subsidised service to schools in checking whether pupils meet the Free School Meal eligibility. This proposal would be to reduce this subsidy for schools through charging from April 2015.
- Estate Management Unit – Statutory Maintenance Audits. The Estates Team undertake subsidised annual audits of schools statutory maintenance performance. This proposal would reduce this subsidy through charges.
- Media and Communications – Currently support is provided by the Communications Team to schools within the borough for free. It is proposed that a new SLA is developed, which give schools the opportunity to buy into a set of services directly with the team.
- Occupational Health (OH) - This service is currently provided free of charge to schools with additional services being purchased from other OH providers. The current contract is being renewed and discussions are ongoing to look at how the contract can be structured in order to meet the full needs of Schools.

It is expected that the percentage impact on a school’s budget is 0.1%.

Council Tax Collection (£500k)

As part of the work to drive up Council Tax collection rates Lewisham is working with the Behavioural Insights Team (BIT), formerly at the Cabinet Office, to review current interaction with residents such as notices (initial demand, follow up reminders, text messages, bailiff letters etc.), as well as the less tangible elements of the recovery cycle, like timing and channel.

This work will build upon the behavioural insights literature taken from fields such as Social Psychology and Behavioural Economics, alongside the practical application that BIT has gained from working with organisations such as HMRC and Manchester City Council on tax and council tax. In the case of HMRC a randomised control trial on using revised tax collection letters highlighted a 15 percentage point increase in tax compliance from the new style compared to the old style letters. This work draws heavily from national and international work on tax paying and decision making, for further information please see:

WALSH, Keith. Understanding Taxpayer Behaviour – New Opportunities for Tax Administration. *The Economic and Social Review*, [S.l.], v. 43, n. 3, Autumn, p. 451–475, Feb. 2013. ISSN 0012-9984. Available at: <<http://www.esr.ie/article/view/46>>.

The revenue aims to increase Council Tax collection by £500k equivalent to a 0.5% increase in Council Tax collection rates.

Investment Strategy (£250k)

This review is focused on the level of return the Council receives on its current investments with an aim to increase this by £250k. Further details on this proposal can be found in the investment strategy paper.

3. Description of service and proposal

Blue Badge Administration Fee (£24k)

This proposal is to charge £10 per Disabled Person's Blue Badge issued. This would cover the cost of the badge (£4.60) and some of the administration costs.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

None of these proposals would impact upon staff, voluntary sector or other council services.

Schools SLA

There is expected to be a 0.1% impact on schools budget.

Council Tax Collection

Reshaping of correspondence with residents over council tax reminders.

Investment Strategy

No impact.

Blue Badge Administration Fee

The customer would have to pay a £10 fee each time they renewed their badge. There are 7,200 Blue Badges in use. The renewal cycle is every 3 years. There would be no staff impact.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

The key risk is that we fail to meet income targets as a result of a drop in service demand or other factors such as economic climate, legislation or changes to government funding. Analysis has been undertaken to model potential impacts to mitigate this risk and a project board has been established to keep oversight on the impact of the changes.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--|-----|--|----------|-----|--|
| J. | | | I. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | | Low | | | Low | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral |

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/Neutral |
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| | | | | |
|--|-----|--|----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | YES | | NO | |
|--|-----|--|----|--|

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

School SLA
The Council has power to provide these services to schools and there are no specific legal implications save those set out in the general legal implications

Council Tax Collection
There are no specific legal implications for this proposal.

Investment Strategy
Full legal requirements are set out in the financial strategy.

Blue Badge
The Blue Badge (Disabled Persons' Parking) Scheme was introduced in 1971 under Section 21 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 ('the 1970 Act'). The regulations governing the Blue Badge scheme (The Disabled Persons (Badges for Motor vehicles) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2007 provide local authorities with the discretion to charge a fee on the issue of badge. This fee cannot exceed £10. (This savings proposal is accordingly compliant with statutory provisions.)

Local authorities should note that only successful applicants should be asked to pay the badge issue fee. The fee may also be charged if badge holders request replacements for badges that have been reported as lost or stolen or because they are not clearly legible or have been damaged.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|-----|

7. Human Resources

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | No |
|--|--|----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

- * (not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
- ** (covered by council employee)
- *** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender: | Female: | Male: | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | |

Appendix 1 Section H – Enforcement & Regulation

H1: Restructuring of enforcement & regulatory services

| Restructuring of Enforcement and Regulatory Services | |
|--|---|
| Lead officer | Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Public Realm |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development |
| Reference no. | H1 |
| Short summary of proposal | Restructure of services to create community protection hub, public realm hub and built environment hub. The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 4. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 3,987.4 Including approx £180k for business support (which is being reviewed under a separate review) | (982.0) | 3,005.4 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------|------------------------|------------|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 800 | 0 | 0 | 800 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>A range of services have been considered to sit within a number of hubs: The first stage of the review has been to develop a model which will allow synergies between services and management savings to be achieved.</p> <p>The model has identified the following groupings of services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing the public realm hub – this will include existing cleansing, waste management and green scene functions together with the clean streets enforcement function and the street markets service which were previously managed as part of the environmental health and trading standards functions respectively. • Community and health protection hub – this will combine the current community safety/anti-social behaviour functions with licensing of licensed premises, trading standards, and existing environmental health and protection functions. These services are seen as core to health protection as well as community protection. • Built environment hub – the key services which contribute to the development of the built environment in Lewisham are Regeneration and Asset Management and Planning. Building Control, which previously was part of housing enforcement functions, has been combined with Regeneration and Asset Management. In addition, aspects of Environmental Protection may appropriately be combined with other functions within the Planning Service. <p>Following this model a restructure of services within the Community and Health protection hub is proposed.</p> |

3. Description of service and proposal

Saving proposal description

A restructure of all service areas within the community and health protection hub is proposed.

A reduction of staffing and a change in roles will be required, with ensuring that staff in the new structure have the appropriate training and skills to deliver across a number of activities.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

There will be an impact in relation to the following:

- ability to cover all aspects of current roles and activities of these service areas.
- A reduction in the Councils ability to provide provision other than on a reactive and intelligence based / risk based model.
- A reduction in staff numbers

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

A revision of the Councils enforcement policy will be undertaken to provide clarity of role and requirements.

Appropriate training for roles in the new structure will be supported by the Council.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| D. | | C. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | | |
|--|--|--|--------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| Ethnicity: | | Medium | |
|------------|--|--------|--|
| | | | |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|---|--|--------|---------|
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| N/A | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|

| 6. Legal |
|---|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal |
| Staff consultation will be required for changes to the current structure. |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|----|

| 7. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | | Yes |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | |
| *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim | | | | | | | |
| **(covered by council employee) | | | | | | | |
| ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |
| | Scale 1 – 2 | Scale 3 – 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
| FTE | 0 | 3 | 5.2 | 54 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Head Count | 0 | 3 | 6 | 54 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

7. Human Resources

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|
| Vacant* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacant** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacant*** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: 36 | | Male: 36 | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 17 | White: 49 | Other: 3 | | Not Known: 3 | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 28 | | | Not Known: 44 | | | |

Appendix 1 Section I – Corporate and Management Overheads

I1: Reduction in corporate management and professional support services

| Reduction in corporate management and professional support services | |
|---|--|
| Lead officers | Barry Quirk / Barrie Neal / Selwyn Thompson / David Austin / Kath Nicholson / Duncan Dewhurst / Andreas Ghosh / Robyn Fairman |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Council-Wide |
| Portfolio | Resources |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts Select Committee |
| Reference no. (to be provided by finance) | |
| Short summary of proposal (to be included in overall report) | <p>The democratic core of the Council and the corporate management arrangements are the very essence of the authority. The Council is a vehicle for community self governance before it is an agency with functional responsibilities for securing services and activities locally. The Mayor and Council assures the public accountability of an array of functions; and the Council’s corporate management ensures that these functions are designed and delivered cost-effectively.</p> <p>It essential that the costs of governance and corporate management are considered alongside the overall commitment to those significant savings being made across the organisation. However, it is crucial that the Council retains a sufficient corporate capability to generate and manage change. Proposals include savings on staffing levels across a wide range of activities, mitigated in part by new working arrangements which seek to streamline management processes that support governance and corporate working.</p> <p>Proposals also include further efficiencies in the delivery of the Council’s professional services. These include, finance, legal services, audit and risk, human resources as well as information management & technology.</p> |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| £35,862 | £5,150 | £30,712 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | |
|---|----------|----------|-----------------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015-2018 |
| £2,090 | 0 | 0 | £2,090 |

2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's)

| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | DSG | (Y) | HRA | (N) |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| Approximately £77,000 of the base budget identified covers DSG. | | | | |

3. Description of service and proposal

Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed

Among other things, the purpose of this corporate core includes the:

- public accountability of Council functions and activities;
- overall financial stewardship and legality;
- coherent coordination of diverse policy programmes; and the
- strategic commissioning of a range of differing services & monitoring their performance

Over the years the Council has reduced the cost of its corporate core such that it is now relatively lean (compared to other like-sized authorities) in terms of numbers of senior managers and the staff teams that support these central functions. This reduction in corporate capacity has, however, led to questioning the capability of the central core successfully to manage the scale of changes that the Council needs to implement.

In particular the “four directorate” organisational structure that we have had for a number of years affords real strengths in service delivery but we need to move forward with greater flexibility over the coming period. Over the past six months officers have looked at the issue of bringing a range of other distributed functions together so that they can be delivered at lower cost. These include policy & performance; business support functions as well as strategic service commissioning.

For the coming year officers have identified opportunities to make substantial savings in policy and performance as well as in business support. A different view is being taken in respect of strategic service commissioning. This is because the Council is working closely with its health service partners to frame our joint commissioning properly so as to meet the demanding and dynamic requirements of integrating health and social care commissioning. And aside from an efficiency saving of 5 per cent for 2015-16, it is considered sensible to examine further the option for savings from this function in 2016/17 and 2017/18.

As well as a specific review of the corporate communications function, the professional services element of this savings proposal package includes the following:

- Finance – a statutory accounting function; financial, business and management accounting advice to management as well as a payroll and pension function.
- Legal Services – legal advice and representation in all Council matters including social care; contracts; education; employment law; property; planning; environment; prosecutions; debt recovery; and governance; for internal clients.
- Audit & Risk – responsible for the Council’s corporate internal audit, counter fraud, insurance, risk management and health & safety arrangements. It provides assurances on and contributes to the safe, efficient and effective delivery of Council’s Services, acting as an agent to challenge where the need and opportunity for improvement is identified.
- IMT Division – Information Management and Technology (IM&T) services. This includes the client role and system support for all major contracts for corporate technology and all larger “line-of-business” systems. It also includes provision of print services, records management services for Social Care, telephony, remote and mobile technologies. The service also provides all information management services, including management of FOI, Data Protection, information risk management and ICT security.

3. Description of service and proposal

- Human Resources – The division commissions approximately 2,000 training places. Some 50% of these are aimed at employees in the private and voluntary sector. The programmes include: health and safety, leadership, safeguarding, and technical social care training.

Saving proposal description

Direct and Indirect costs of governance (Saving £120k) and Membership of LGA and London Councils (Saving £20k)

The Council's basic governance will not change over the next four years. The Council's governance enables public decisions to be made in an open and accountable manner by elected politicians who themselves are accountable to the public at election and between elections. The Council's governance model, since 2002, is comprised of a Directly Elected Mayor and an elected Council of 54 members. The model also now includes the cost of functioning for the 18 local assemblies (some £0.3m). These local assemblies have become critical for the development of councillors' roles in their wards. Additionally a small budget of some £0.1m is dedicated to supporting the Young Mayor programme. There are no proposals for budget savings in respect of the direct costs of corporate governance.

However, a proposal is included that incorporates savings from more efficient means of supporting the business management of the Council, the office of the Mayor & Cabinet, as well as the Scrutiny function (some £40,000 in each area producing an aggregate saving of £120,000, from a combined budget of just over £1m). In addition, efficiencies made by the local government bodies to which the Council is in membership enables a saving of £20,000 to be made in this area.

Corporate management (direct cost savings of £190k; and support service costs of £160k)

The purpose of corporate management is to ensure that the Mayor and Council receive the best professional advice; that services are effectively designed and efficiently secured; that the organisation as a whole operates in a directed, coordinated and coherent fashion; that local partnerships function effectively; and that the Mayor and Council are assured that the Council's duties are performed adequately and that agreed policy priorities are delivered. What's more corporate management is not a layer of managerial coordination, but a capacity to generate and implement agreed changes.

It is crucial that the Council maintains an effective corporate management capability and already there is evidence that, in some areas, the Council's corporate managers are over-stretched. The Council has a moderate sized executive management team and a reasonable number of senior staff on JNC terms and conditions (i.e. Heads of Service, Directors and Executive Directors). That noted, we will need to reduce our senior management staffing numbers. We consider that a 5 per cent efficiency saving should be made in this area (equivalent to £190,000) for 2015-16 prior to any further transformation of the Council's management arrangements.

Secretariat functions will be re-organised and managed in a more streamlined way to achieve the proposed savings (equivalent to £160,000). New working arrangements will impact on the way work is managed and the level of support available across directorates.

Policy, Performance, Service Review and Intelligence – saving £900k

The functions include the policy development, performance monitoring, service review, consultation and research & intelligence capacity of the organisation. The savings proposal represents around 50 per cent savings on the salaries spend across the identified activities currently located in Laurence House. Opportunities to remodel the function have been evaluated and proposals will be brought forward for staff consultation to effect a significant reduction in salaries costs. The functions exist across the respective directorates in a fairly inconsistent and uneven manner. By reflecting further on the purpose of these activities and their grouping there is the potential to streamline activities and reduce the potential for duplication.

Commissioning – saving £260k

The proposed review of strategy and commissioning activities across the Council is expected to deliver savings in the region of £260k. This is a small (5 per cent) efficiency saving, although it needs to be recognised that this activity rests

3. Description of service and proposal

on the overall cost of service purchased at some £300m and it is in this area that the bulk of supply costs will be reduced. Staffing support is currently fragmented across a range of service areas. A review is underway to make an immediate salaries savings whilst working towards a new model better co-ordinating and streamlining activities for future delivery of this important function.

Corporate Communications – saving £50k

A review of the Council's corporate communications function is expected to deliver a budget saving of some £50k (on overall spend of some £770k) for 2015/16.

Professional Services – Saving £390k

The Finance Division has recently concluded a staffing re-organisation in order to achieve savings of £600k and the new structure has had some budget flexibility built into it particularly to provide for senior level support arising from capacity risks. This together with a consolidation and review of non salaried budgets following the restructure has identified that a saving of £150k is achievable.

The Legal Services Division saving of £50k will be achieved through a review of the staffing structure and the deletion of a post.

The Audit & Risk Division saving of £90k will be achieved by the release of budget currently used to fund additional Health & Safety support on specific tasks which will be absorbed by the permanent team and a review of the Anti-Fraud and Corruption Team priorities to coincide with the transfer of Benefit Investigators to the Department for Work and Pensions on the 1 April 2015.

The IMT Division saving of £50k will be achieved through a review of the Council's landline and mobile phone budgets. Costs on these have reduced particularly as a result of the recent mobile contract retender however capturing the minor amounts of savings arising has been difficult as these relatively small budgets have been spread Council wide. It is proposed to centralise these budgets and thereby capture these savings.

HR Division saving of £50k will be achieved through a review of the training courses. This will identify whether some courses can either be stopped or provision reduced or be configured and delivered in a different way and focus on ensuring that the Council only provides the more strategically important training.

Summary of proposals

| Service Area | | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| Direct and indirect costs of governance | £120,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Member allowances 2. Members direct support (IT and training) 3. Members support (business, scrutiny and the Mayor's office) 4. Local Assemblies 5. Young Mayor's Team |
| Membership of the LGA and London Councils | £20,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Government Association 2. London Councils |
| Direct and support costs of corporate management | £190,000 £160,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chief Executive, Executive Management Team and Heads of Service 2. Administrative and Executive Offices Secretariat Support |
| Performance and strategy | £260,000 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategy, Commissioning and Performance |

3. Description of service and proposal

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | £900,000 | 2. Policy and Performance |
| Core corporate functions | £50,000 | Corporate Communications (digital) |
| Professional Services | £390,000 | Legal Services, Information, Management & Technology, Finance and Human Resources |
| TOTAL | £2,090,000 | |

5. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

The savings proposal for £120k on member related services breaks down as follows: £40k Business & Committee (responsible for council business & committees, civic events, educational appeals, international partnerships); £40k on scrutiny (responsible for OSC , six select committees and member development); and £40k on the Mayor's office (responsible for support to the Mayor & Cabinet, Young Mayor's Team and Lewisham Congress). The savings proposed will marginally impact on staffing and operational budgets. For Business & Committee a vacant post is proposed to be deleted: formerly the post of the political assistant to the Liberal Democrat Group. The Overview & Scrutiny saving is proposed, subject to staff consultation, to be delivered by a reduction in the salaries budget. The Mayor's Office savings are proposed on a simple corresponding efficiency basis.

The £900k savings arising from the policy and performance function will impact significantly (it is a 50 per cent reduction) on the staffing that supports a range of activities including: policy development, performance management, consultation, as well as corporate research & intelligence. Some work in this area will cease and other activities will have to be curtailed. Standards set formerly for a proactive and responsive service will have to be kept under constant review.

Other savings in corporate management and professional services are not anticipated to have a significant impact on the Council's ability to achieve its aims.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

The modeling of new management arrangements will seek to promote the benefits of a more streamlined approach to the respective work areas. The aim is to eliminate unnecessary specialties and foster more generic capability. A process of prioritisation will be required across all work areas, and though some activities will cease, others will have to be done in a different way and the associated risk to standards of performance will have to be kept under constant review. The pervasive impact of Internet based research and data analytics offers the prospect of doing some policy and performance work more efficiently.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | Secondary Priority | Corporate Priorities:- |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| J | J | A. Community Leadership and |

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|--|--|---------|--|
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
| Positive | <i>Negative</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Neutral | Positive | <i>Negative</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Neutral | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| High | <i>Medium</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Low | High | <i>Medium</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Low | |

| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | x |

| 6. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | High | | Medium | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Low/ neutral |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|--|------|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |

| | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | High | Medium | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| Medium impact arising in relation to policy development and monitoring duties under the Equalities Act 2010. | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|------------|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | YES | | NO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|------------|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| 7. Legal | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| Need to maintain statutory commitment in terms of relevant performance returns to Whitehall Departments and the development of, and support for statutory equalities duties (policy development, monitoring & reviews, overall approach to equalities analysis assessments and specific assessments due). | |

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------|
| 8. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | YES | |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | |
| <small>*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim ** (covered by council employee) *** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state</small> | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |
| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | 4 | 15 | 25 | 9 | 3 | 25 |

8. Human Resources

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: 48 | | Male: 33 | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 22 | White: 57 | Other: 1 | Not Known: 1 | | | |
| Disability: | 5 | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: Gay / Lesbian – 5 Straight / Heterosexual - 25 | | | Not Known: 51 | | | |

Appendix 1 Section J – Schools Effectiveness

J1: Increasing income from Educational Psychologists and Learning Difficulties teams

| Increasing Income from Schools SLAs | |
|--|--|
| Lead officer | Sue Tipler |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Children and Young People |
| Portfolio | Children and Young People |
| Select Committee | Children and Young People |
| Reference no. | J1 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p><u>School Effectiveness Services – Educational Psychologists and Specific Learning Difficulties Teams</u></p> <p>This strand is looking at all aspects of services to schools to identify opportunities to increase income (most of which are set out in the income generation strand above). In addition, savings proposals of £751k have been identified through reducing the central funding for Educational Psychologists and through grant substitution from the DSG around the management of our early years function and from the Basic Needs Grant for staff working on the expansion of school places.</p> <p>Currently all Education and Health Care Plans (EHCP) must include ‘psychological advice’. The Education Psychologist Team covers costs for supporting EHCPs, a core offer for each school, a traded offer of additional services, plus an amount for management, administration and building capacity case work in schools. The proposal is to trade more of the core service while helping to build capacity in schools.</p> <p><u>Use of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and Basic Needs Grant to fund activity</u></p> <p>Expenditure on planning school places can be met in the future from the Basic Needs Grant and provision for 2,3, and 4 year old provision in the borough can be met from the Dedicated Schools Grant.</p> |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure£000's | Income£000's | Net Budget£000's |
| 1,420 | (282) | 1,138 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: |
| 751 | 0 | 0 | 751 |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | Yes |
| | | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | |
| The proposal to increase the income from the Service Level Agreement which will increase the costs for schools which will need to be paid for from the Individual Schools Budget block of the DSG. | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| Education Psychology The Education Psychologist Team covers costs for supporting statements, a funded core offer for each school and additional traded services, plus an amount for management, administration and building capacity case work in |

3. Description of service and proposal

schools.

Planning School Places

The team provides the project management to meet demand for primary school places expansion across the borough.

Provision for 2,3, and 4 year old provision

This funding forms the support to secure sufficient places within the Local Authority to deliver the entitlement for 3 & 4 years olds and the more recent expansion of places for 2 year olds from disadvantaged families.

Saving proposal description

Education Psychology

It is proposed to reduce the amount of funding for Education Psychologist support to a statutory minimum, continuing support for ECHPs. All other activity will become traded. This will result in a saving of £300k either through increased income or reduced staffing, if schools do not take up the offer.

Place Planning

The project management costs of the school place planning team are currently provided for within the General Fund budget. It is now proposed to charge costs against the basic need capital grant allocation for the delivery of additional school places. The costs proposed are £200k.

2, 3, and 4 year old child care places

The costs of ensuring a sufficient provision for 2, 3, and 4 year old child care places in the borough are provided for within the General Fund with an estimated cost of £251k. The government allocates grant for the funding of free entitlement processes and managing the two year old scheme through the Dedicated Schools Grant. It is now proposed to fund this general fund expenditure through the early years grant allocation within the DSG.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

The proposals will give greater choice to schools with regard to the Education Psychology services they require. Those services that are not valued by schools will decline while the services that schools value will grow. This may impact on the number of staff employed in different areas.

The charging of place planning project management costs to the basic need grant will have the effect of reducing the capital funds available for the delivery of additional places.

The funding of early years responsibilities through the DSG can be done with no impact on the service delivered.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Schools do not take up the Education Psychologists offer and support for Special Education Needs reduces. This will be mitigated through monitoring of school performance.

There is a risk that the Dedicated Schools Grant conditions in the future may preclude these free entitlement management costs being met from the grant.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | Secondary Priority | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| B | G. | |
| Impact of saving on corporate | Impact of saving on corporate | |

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|-----------------|--|---------|
| priority | | | priority | | |
| | | Neutral | | | Neutral |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | |
| | | Low | | | Low |
| C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | | | | | |

| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
|---|---|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|---|------|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | High | | |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|----|--|

| 6. Legal | |
|---|--|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| X | |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|----|---|----|

| 7. Human Resources | |
|--|---|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Potentially if schools do not take up traded offer. |

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim

** (covered by council employee)

*** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 – 2 | Scale 3 – 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | | |

Appendix 1 Section K – Crime Reduction

K1: Retendering & targeted reduction in Drug & Alcohol services

| Retendering and Targeted Reduction in Drug and Alcohol Services. | |
|--|---|
| Lead officer | Geeta Subramanian-Mooney |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Service, Customer services, CYP |
| Portfolio | Community Safety |
| Select Committee | Healthier Communities |
| Reference no. | K1 |
| Short summary of proposal | The current drug and alcohol treatment system in Lewisham is currently performing well with a range of outcome measures consistently amongst the best in London. In order to build on this success while delivering savings we will be tendering a number of services to increase efficiencies while reducing and targeting provision such as residential rehabilitation. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--|--------------|------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 5,688 | | |
| Public Health (PH) Main Grant Allocation 2014-15: | 4,900 | |
| Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) Funding: | 511 | |
| LBL: | 277 | |
| Expenditure£000's | Income£000's | Net Budget£000's |
| 5,688 | (5,411) | 277 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 574 | 30 | 0 | 604 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>The Prevention and Inclusion service within LB Lewisham currently deliver and commission a range of services to meet the needs of those with a drug and/or alcohol problem and to reduce harm to society as a whole.</p> <p>The team works to align with the ambition of both Public Health England and the Government's Drug Strategy to increase the number of individuals recovering from addiction. It works to reduce drug and alcohol related offending as it is well demonstrated that cessation of drug use reduces re-offending significantly. This in turn will have benefits to a range of wider services and will address those who cause the most harm in local communities.</p> <p>The National Drug Strategy 2010 puts a key focus on recovery. Whilst recognising that recovering from dependent substance misuse is an individual person-centred journey, there are high aspirations for increasing recovery outcomes. Drug and alcohol recovery systems are increasingly being geared towards the achievement of the following outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freedom from dependence on drugs or alcohol • Prevention of drug related deaths and blood borne viruses • A reduction in crime and re-offending |

3. Description of service and proposal

- Sustained employment
- The ability to access and sustain suitable accommodation
- Improvement in mental and physical health and wellbeing
- Improved relationships with family members, partners and friends
- The capacity to be an effective and caring parent

The services being reviewed as part of this work include:

- All drug and alcohol treatment services in the borough including substitute medication prescribing and residential treatment services for ages 10 years upwards
- Borough-wide training and awareness raising function relating to drug and alcohol abuse including workforce development and work in schools
- Prevention campaigns

Saving proposal description

1. Revitalising and improving the shared care arrangements (GP services) including a new approach to alcohol services - £250k
2. Refocusing our work with young people to more efficiently meet their needs – redesign to realise savings elsewhere
3. Contract efficiencies - £100k
4. Targeting of tier 4 residential services - £150K
5. Reduction of service user involvement funding - £40K
6. Restructure of the team - £64K (split over 15/16 & 16/17)

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

- Reduction in some levels of the service such as residential rehab beds – we may need to increase the threshold for service to accommodate this.
- Despite lower levels of investment, the current treatment system is providing the best outcomes and the best value for money of the comparator boroughs. Value for money is calculated by amount invested divided by number of successful completions – reductions in funding have the potential to impact on this performance. It is important that we maintain this current level of performance around successful completions as this is due to become one of the three ‘health premium’ indicators in 2015/16 which **will attract funding** from Public Health England.
- Provision in some GP surgeries will be reduced to ensure that all services have sufficient capacity and expertise to meet the needs of clients in Lewisham.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

- **Reduction in level of service available in some areas (e.g. residential rehab):** Mitigated through a detailed and thorough service re design – including service users – to target services at those most in need and make innovative use of alternative provision
- **Service disruption during reconfiguration may impact on outcomes:** Mitigated through on-going contract monitoring and robust performance management running alongside re-commissioning process
- **Match funding implications for Drugs Intervention Programme (match funding required to obtain funding from MOPAC):** Mitigated through regular review and dialogue
- **Changes in Probation may add demand and need into the system on a statutory basis:** Mitigated through frequent dialogue and flagging of issues with MOJ and MOPAC

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | Corporate Priorities:- | |
| H. | | D. | | A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | | Low | Low | | |

| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
|---|--|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | Not yet clear – it is proposed that the refocusing of work with GPs will mean that some provision is not available in all services. It is unclear exactly which surgeries will not be providing these services but we will ensure there is an equitable geographic spread. |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|---|--|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | Medium | |
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | | | Low |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| <p>In general it is expected that the new treatment system will have a positive impact across all equalities strands by bringing more services into non-stigmatising settings and reducing the need to access a single service offer that can hamper engagement. However, there are a number of areas which require attention including access for women with children, ensuring that the services reach out to BME communities and that DDA requirements are met at all services.</p> <p>Generally, given the likely nature of the service users – EAA assessments will be required to be worked in to the proposals in more depth.</p> <p>In relation to the restructure of the team, the general employment legal implications will apply and the Council’s Management of Change Guidelines.</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|

| |
|---|
| 6. Legal |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal |
| |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No – service users and stakeholder consultations already undertaken. |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|
| 7. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | Yes | |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | |
| *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim | | | | | | | |
| **(covered by council employee) | | | | | | | |
| ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | 1 | 14 | 1 | 1 | |
| Head Count | | | 1 | 14 | 1 | 1 | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | 1 | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Workforce Profile Information | | | | | | | |
| Gender: | Female: 10 | | | Male: 5 | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 7 | White: 7 | Other: 1 | | Not Known: 0 | | |
| Disability: | 1 | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 5 | | | Not Known: 10 | | | |

K2: YOS reorganisation, changes in interventions & reduction in contracts

| YOS reorganisation, Changes in Interventions Delivered and a Reduction in Contracts | |
|---|--|
| Lead officer | Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Community Safety |
| Select Committee | Children & Young People |
| Reference no. | K2 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p>Lewisham YOS will be making the following savings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in general overhead costs • Reduction in reparation projects • Reduction in externally funded programmes • Deletion of staff post |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 1,591.2 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 1,636.1 | (44.9) | 1,591.2 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| <p>Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed</p> <p>Youth Offending Teams have been in operation since 1998 and have delivered positive results in reducing offending and re-offending by children and young people under the age of 18. Lewisham YOS is a high performing team (HMIP 2012) and are currently rated green for all three performance indicators including re-offending where in the last quarter the reduction was the largest in London.</p> <p>Lewisham YOS is responsible for a range of services to the public and a wide range of stakeholders including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention and diversion in collaboration with other children's services and directly at the police station • The delivery of interventions for out of court disposals (Triage, Youth Cautions, Out of Court Disposals and Youth Conditional Cautions) • Court duty at Bromley Youth Court. Attendance at Crown Courts for sentencing • Assessment, Planning, Intervention and Supervision for children and young people subject to court orders according to National standards for Youth Justice 2012. • A service to all victims of youth crime including restorative justice. • Parenting interventions aimed at supporting parents and carers to prevent their children re-offending . and working alongside other Family support services. • Sentence Planning and resettlement services for those young people who receive custodial sentences to reduce the negative impact of incarceration and improving resettlement pathways such as accommodation and education. • Working in the custodial establishment. Undertaking LAC assessments for Remanded Young people. • A range of evidence based interventions to change behaviour (CBT, Family approaches, group work interventions aimed at tackling particular offences e.g. knife crime) • Specialist Forensic Mental health and Drug and Alcohol service |

3. Description of service and proposal

Saving proposal description

Lewisham YOS are proposing £200,000. This level of savings is being proposed from the core budget as external funding via the YJB grant is unpredictable and may fall in future years in line with local reductions. The YJB contribution to remand costs is unlikely to be sustained as full responsibility of commissioning remand beds is transferred to the local authority. This budget pressure remains a concern.

Savings will be met through the following:

£15,000 Reduction in general overhead costs

This will be achieved through a move to a paperless office, and through streamlining of processes. This work programme has commenced with full implementation for 1st April 2015.

£40,000 Reduction in reparation projects

Externally funded programmes will cease to be funded.

£100,642 Reduction in externally funded programmes and contracts

Re- negotiation of contracts including the Appropriate Adult Service with Catch 22 and cease to deliver a range of external programmes including Arts activities, employment and training programmes and targeted intervention. Interventions will be developed by existing staff and will be delivered by staff across the team, in line with their revised JDs following the 2013 restructure.

£42,500 Deletion of 1 vacant post in the YOS

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Whilst overall cases have decreased over time (due to the triage provision-diverting young people out of the criminal justice system) the proportion of medium and high risk have remained level.

Risk is measured through both static (type of offences) and variable (Education / mental health status) factors as assessed by the YOS officer. Risk is fluid and can and does change.

Vulnerability has seen an increase in scores of 2 and 3 (on a scale from 0-4). Vulnerability is measured against a range of criteria including self-harm/ feelings of depression.

Lewisham YOS has seen a steady decline in the number of first time entrants since 2009. The Triage initiative has helped divert low level offenders from receiving a criminal conviction and has reduced the number of young people coming in to the service. It is unlikely that the decline will be maintained and there is evidence of leveling of new entrants.

Taking this into account, staff will be required to absorb the work of the deleted posts with additional cases to manage, plus additional duties such as running groups, delivering early intervention and wrap around family support. The service will have to stop the delivery of certain aspects of the service, referring young people to partner agencies.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

In order to manage the risks posed by the savings, we will increase focus on management oversight and reduce the amount of time that Operational Managers and Senior Practitioners are allocating to work with delivery partners, we will be streamlining service meetings and increasing office based time. There will be increased focus on Quality

4. Impact of proposal

Assurance in line with the anticipated HMIP inspection.

Young people will not be able to attend the diverse range of programmes that are currently in existence which will be tailored to their offending behaviour. Instead, young people will attend more generic programmes which will aim to address their needs.

Overhead costs will be reduced through the introduction of a paper free office. Discussions with the CPS and Courts are taking place to ensure that we comply with legislative requirements.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| D. | | B. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | | |
|--|--|--|--------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--------|---------|
| Ethnicity: | | Medium | |
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | Medium | Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | Medium | Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | Medium | Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | Medium | Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

The YOS works with a high number of young people who are from disadvantaged backgrounds, many of whom are also from BAME backgrounds. Young men make up 80% of the cohort. Therefore any cuts are likely to affect young BAME boys more than other groups of individuals.

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

We will aim to address this through the development and delivery of a targeted in house programme aimed at reducing the reoffending of BAME boys.

An EAA assessment will be required. Any variation to existing contracts can only be by agreement between the parties although there is a right of voluntary termination if the parties cannot agree to necessary changes.

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

Staff consultation will be required for changes to the current structure.
Any changes/ ceasing of contracts will need to give appropriate notice to providers.

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|-----|---|----|

7. Human Resources

| | |
|--|-----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Yes |
|--|-----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 – 2 | Scale 3 – 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | 3 | 6 | 25 | 3 | 1 | |
| Head Count | | 3 | 6 | 25 | 3 | 1 | |
| Vacant* | | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Gender: | Female: 27 | Male: 11 | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 20 | White: 13 | Other: 2 | Not Known: 3 |
| Disability: | 1 | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 6 | | Not Known: 32 | |

K3: Reduction in funding for Integrated Offender Management service

| Reduction in Funding for Integrated Offender Management Service | |
|---|--|
| Lead officer | Geeta Subramanian-Mooney |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Service, Customer services, CYP |
| Portfolio | Community Safety |
| Select Committee | Safer Stronger |
| Reference no. | K3 |
| Short summary of proposal | Ending of the case management element of the borough's Integrated Offender management service. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 277 | | |
| Public Health (PH) Main Grant Allocation 2014-15: | 4,900 | |
| Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) Funding: | 511 | |
| LBL: | 277 | |
| Expenditure£000's | Income£000's | Net Budget£000's |
| 5,688 | (5,411) | 277 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>The Prevention and Inclusion service within LB Lewisham currently deliver and commission a range of services to meet the needs of those with a drug and/or alcohol problem and to reduce harm to society as a whole.</p> <p>The team works to align with the ambition of both Public Health England and the Government's Drug Strategy to increase the number of individuals recovering from addiction. It works to reduce drug and alcohol related offending as it is well demonstrated that cessation of drug use reduces re-offending significantly. This in turn will have benefits to a range of wider services and will address those who cause the most harm in local communities.</p> <p>The National Drug Strategy 2010 puts a key focus on recovery. Whilst recognising that recovering from dependent substance misuse is an individual person-centred journey, there are high aspirations for increasing recovery outcomes. Drug and alcohol recovery systems are increasingly being geared towards the achievement of the following outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freedom from dependence on drugs or alcohol • Prevention of drug related deaths and blood borne viruses • A reduction in crime and re-offending • Sustained employment • The ability to access and sustain suitable accommodation • Improvement in mental and physical health and wellbeing |

3. Description of service and proposal

- Improved relationships with family members, partners and friends
- The capacity to be an effective and caring parent

The team seeks to meet some of these outcomes through the commissioning of an Integrated Offender Management (IOM) service which seeks to identify drug using offenders in the criminal justice system and then provide additional support to help them engage with drug treatment services.

It is this IOM service that is the subject of this proposal.

Saving proposal description

The proposal is to withdraw funding from the case management/support element of the IOM service. This means that although individuals with a treatment need will still be identified in the criminal justice system there will be no additional support to assist to help them engage.

There is no statutory requirement to have an Integrated Management of Offender Service. It forms part of the Home Office and Ministry of Justice strategy to prevent crime and reduce reoffending. It provides a degree of control by multi agency providers including local government over offenders who are at a high risk of reoffending, even when they are not subject to statutory supervision. Proposals for changes to this service are being put forward at national level to provide support through other organisations to be set up as part of the national Transforming Justice changes.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Those who are involved in the criminal justice system are notoriously difficult to engage in drug/alcohol treatment services. Without additional support this engagement is even less likely which means that their criminal activity is likely to continue with all the associated impacts on other Lewisham residents.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

This work is to be delivered via the new Probation and Community Rehabilitation Companies through the Transforming Justice changes for managing adult offenders. It is still unclear as to the service offer/ delivery models and therefore impact of these changes overall.

We are working closing with the Ministry of Justice, The Mayors Office for Policing and Crime and our local leads for this area to ensure that we input into the redevelopments and future planning in this area.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and |
|--|----------|-----|--|----------|-----|---|
| H. | | | D. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | | Low | | | Low | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------|
| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | equity |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | | |
|---|--|--|--------|--|--|--|

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|--|--|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | Medium | |
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

Generally the impact of the service will be on those who would otherwise receive it. As young men from BME communities are over represented in the criminal justice system the impact there is likely to be increased. There is also a general impact on those who are victims of crime and the same group are again over represented.

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

This will require notice and ending of a contractual arrangement.

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|----|---|----|

7. Human Resources

| | |
|--|----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | No |
|--|----|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

7. Human Resources

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 – 2 | Scale 3 – 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | | |

Appendix 1 Section L – Culture & Community Services

L1: Review of main voluntary & community service grants programme

| Review of Main VCS Grants Programme | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Lead officer | Liz Dart |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Third Sector and Community |
| Select Committee | Safer Stronger |
| Reference no. | L1 |
| Short summary of proposal | Review of main VCS grants programme. A new set of priority themes and criteria for the main grants programme are currently being consulted on. The consultation includes a proposal to reduce the grants budget by up to £1.5m |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: 5889.4 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 5,955.4 | (66.0) | 5,889.4 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 1,125 | 375 | 0 | 1500 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>The current main grants programme was agreed by Mayor and Cabinet Contracts in July 2011. Funding was awarded for two and a half years from October 2011 to the end of March 2014 to 73 organisations. Funding was provided over four themes; Children and Young People, Building Social Capital, Gateway Services including Advice and Communities that Care. An extension to the programme for a further year was agreed in December 2013 taking the current funding to 31 March 2015.</p> <p>In addition to the £5.9 million grants budget Lewisham Council has contracts to a value of over £20 million with voluntary and community sector organisations to provide a wide range of services. These include youth activities, children's centres, supported housing and public health initiatives. The types of organisations that Lewisham is contracting with ranges from large national charities to small local community based organisations.</p> |
| Saving proposal description |
| <p>Officers have reviewed the criteria that were used for the programme in 2011 taking into account changes in local and national policy and the changing needs and priorities in Lewisham. In establishing the priority themes for the grants programme they have considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of need locally • The contribution the third sector can make to meeting the priority • The availability of other sources of funding locally <p>The proposed programme themes are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong and Cohesive Communities 2. Communities that Care 3. Access to Advice |

3. Description of service and proposal

4. Widening access to Arts and Sports

Consultation on the proposed criteria, application process and indicative saving level opened on 30th July and closes on 29th October. A report will be going to Safer Stronger Select Committee and Mayor and Cabinet in November 2014 seeking approval to open the new programme to applications. The deadline for applications is proposed as 4th Feb with draft recommendation reports and 3 month notice of change to current grants where applicable being issued by 30th March 2015. The draft recommendations and any appeals will be presented to Mayor and Cabinet Contracts in April 2015 for decision and new grants will commence from 1st July 2015.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

The level of reduction proposed is likely to lead to some organisations losing significant levels of funding. This could mean the closure of some groups and the loss of some services that are no longer deemed to be a priority. However the remaining grants budget will be able to provide a good range of VCS support ensuring that the sector is able to remain an active partner in meeting the needs of Lewisham residents.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Legal challenge – risk of JR’s from VCS organisations losing funding. | Careful design of process, appropriate consultation, consideration of equalities impact |
| 2 | Slippage – ensuring that information presented to members at each stage of process is complete enough to enable decisions to be taken. | Careful programme management to ensure preparation done at every stage. Engage with members early to ascertain areas of concern and address them. Issue notice to all funded organisations prior to April decisions to meet 3 month compact obligation. |
| 3 | Capacity – open process could bring large volumes of applications | Not possible to extend assessment period without further delays to saving implementation so extra capacity may need to be identified. |

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment A. Young people’s achievement and involvement B. Clean, green and liveable C. Safety, security and a visible presence D. Strengthening the local economy E. Decent Homes for all F. Protection of children G. Caring for adults and the older people H. Active, health citizens I. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| A. | | I. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | Medium | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------|--|--|
| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--------|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | Medium | |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| <p>The proposed new programme does not include a dedicated Children and Young People theme although organisations delivering services for CYP will be able to apply to other themes where their activity meets those theme criteria. In all other areas services are likely to be provided but this will only be known once final decisions on the applications have been made.</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| 6. Legal | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| <p>The giving of grants to voluntary organisations is discretionary. The Council must act reasonably in relation to funding decisions taking into account only relevant considerations and disregarding irrelevancies. Regard has to be had to the outcome of the consultation upon the new proposed criteria for eligibility for grant funding. Generally, given the likely nature of the residents that benefit from the services – EAA assessments will be required to be worked in to the proposals in more depth.</p> | |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|---|----|---|-----|

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 7. Human Resources | | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | No |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | |
| *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim | | |

7. Human Resources

**** (covered by council employee)**

***** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state**

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | | |

L2: Libraries staff reorganisation

| Libraries Staff Reorganisation | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Lead officer | Liz Dart |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Community Services |
| Portfolio | Third Sector & Community |
| Select Committee | Safer Stronger |
| Reference no. | L2 |
| Short summary of proposal | Libraries staff reorganisation |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: £4,459.6 | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 5,000.7 | (541.1) | 4,459.6 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 280 | 0 | 0 | 280 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| The libraries service consists of 7 directly provided libraries and 6 community libraries delivered in partnership with voluntary sector organisations. This saving proposal relates to the staffing provision within the libraries service. Staff salaries represent 84% of the service budget. |
| Saving proposal description |
| The libraries service underwent a significant reorganisation in 2011/12 with the introduction of community libraries and a new way of working for the service. This new model is now well embedded and allows the service to look again at its capacity to seek further efficiencies. It is proposed to make a saving of £280k from the libraries salaries budget through a staff reorganisation while ensuring that duties are being carried out at the most cost effective level. |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| The proposal is not intended to affect numbers of libraries or opening hours and should have a limited impact on service users. |
| Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these. |
| There is a risk of a reduction in the quality of service through the loss of 'professional' capacity. The new structure will need to ensure that remaining posts are deployed effectively and that roles are carefully designed to ensure that tasks are carried out at the appropriate level. |

| |
|--|
| Impact on Corporate Priorities: |
|--|

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|--|--|---------|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | |
| I. | | | A. | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | |
| | | Neutral | | | Neutral |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | |
| | | Low | | | Low |

Corporate Priorities:-

- A. Community Leadership and empowerment
- B. Young people’s achievement and involvement
- C. Clean, green and liveable
- D. Safety, security and a visible presence
- E. Strengthening the local economy
- F. Decent Homes for all
- G. Protection of children
- H. Caring for adults and the older people
- I. Active, health citizens
- J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
|---|---|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| All | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|

| 6. Legal | |
|---|--|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| The general employment legal implications will apply and the Council’s Management of Change Guidelines. | |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|-----|---|----|

7. Human Resources

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?

Yes

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim

** (covered by council employee)

*** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | 29.31 | 33.51 | 5.22 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Head Count | 89 | 43 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Vacant* | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 2 | nil | nil | nil |
| Vacant** | 1 | nil | nil | nil | nil | nil | nil |
| Vacant*** | nil | 3 | 0.04 | nil | nil | nil | nil |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: 80 | | Male: 61 | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 48 | White: 81 | Other: 3 | Not Known: 9 | | | |
| Disability: | 7 disabled, 134 not disabled | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 29 straight/heterosexual | | | Not Known: 112 | | | |

Appendix 1 Section M – Housing & non-HRA funded services

M1: Transfer of non housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund

| Transfer of Non-Housing Stock from the HRA to the General Fund | |
|--|--|
| Lead Officer | Genevieve Macklin/Tim Thompson |
| Directorates Affected By Proposal | Customer Services/Resources and Regeneration |
| Portfolio | Housing / Growth and Regeneration |
| Select Committee | Housing |
| Reference Number | M1 |
| Short Summary Of Proposal | Transfer of non-Housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund |

| 1. Financial Information | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000s) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 13,700 | (10,900) | 2,800 |

| 2. Value Of Proposals Per Year (£000s) | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------|------------------------|------------|-----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 700 | 200 | 100 | 1,000 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | Yes |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe this impact below: | | | | | |
| As above, it is proposed to transfer non-Housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund, thus providing an income stream to the General Fund. It will also reduce the amount of debt in the HRA, enabling further investment in existing or new stock. | | | | | |

| 3. Description Of Service And Proposal |
|---|
| Description Of The Service, Functions Or Activities Which Are Being Reviewed: |
| <p>Non-housing stock (e.g. garages and commercial properties) is currently accounted for in the HRA. The proposal is to transfer the income and running costs to the General Fund. This brings the current surplus generated into the General Fund and will, as a part of the Council's commercial asset stock, offer opportunities to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop a consistent approach to the use of Council assets - operational and commercial estates, no 'grey'. - Introduce a new Asset Management Plan and AM system / governance arrangements to strengthen the corporate decision-making processes. - Generate increased income, based on up-to-date market rates, better use of properties and effective rent collection - Better align the commercial estate with corporate service delivery priorities. - Drive transparency. |
| Saving Proposal Description: |
| <p>To transfer the management of the Council's non-Housing stock from the HRA to the General Fund, which would deliver a saving of £1,00k over 3 years. £0.7m of the saving will be attributed to the Housing budget savings target in 2015/16 and will be achieved by changing how the council account's for the stock.</p> <p>The savings of £0.3m, attributable to Resources and Regeneration will be achieved by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optimise the Commercial Estate – Remove the 'Grey' estate (& effectively increase the 'Commercial' estate); Review of Commercial Estate to Increase Market Rentals to Increase Income; Improvements in the debt recovery of the commercial estate rent roll; Transfer of the Non-housing / Commercial assets into the General Fund (from the Housing Revenue Account); Optimisation of the transferred HRA non-housing stock; Optimising the Commercial Estate – moving the Voluntary & Community Sector organisations into more appropriate |

assets (reduce the opportunity cost of them occupying potentially expensive / valuable retail units);
Advertising income from both on and off highways.

4. Impact Of Proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other Council services:

An initial financial analysis has indicated that the income generated as a result of transferring non-Housing stock (i.e. garages and commercial properties) to the General Fund would exceed the running and financing costs of these assets (this estimated surplus includes assumptions for a reduction in stock where garage sites have been identified for potential infill development and commercial properties are not viable or easily transferable e.g. where they form part of a residential block). This proposal would therefore deliver a saving of £1,000k via this surplus and improved portfolio management. Housing's proportion of the saving has been set at £700k. The additional £300k sits with the Commercial Assets team in Resources and Regeneration .

The proposal also reduces the amount of debt in the HRA, thus increasing borrowing capacity to invest in new or existing housing.

The intention is now that the transfer of these assets will be undertaken in autumn 2014, rather than the following financial year as planned. Part of the savings achieved from this transfer will then be used to offset the current budget pressure (£230k) within Housing Needs as a result of the delayed restructure, although this same amount will still need to be delivered in 2015/16.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these:

- in relation to either gaining vacant possession and/or putting new commercial leases in place these processes can take a considerable amount of time.
- Rent review process can also be protracted particularly if the matter has to be referred to a third party in accordance with the leases.
- Resistance from lease holders to the introduction of direct debit payments – resulting in a reduced market for commercial properties;
- Lack of training for debt collection team results in poor implementation of the direct debit payments process;
- Inconsistent application of approach to introducing direct debit payments for rentals reduces effectiveness;
- Reputational issues with regards to advertising on or near the highways (negated by careful selection of advertising content and formats)
- Planning policy restricts scope of advertising income
- May need additional resources to assist with securing possession of the premises and then re-letting to ensure new revenue streams are derived
- the transfer of non housing HRA assets to the GF will mean that this revenue stream will be lost to the HRA;
- some commercial properties may prove physically problematic / impossible to divorce from the housing assets once transferred to the GF.

Impact On Corporate Priorities:

| Impact On Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership & Empowerment B. Young People's Achievement & Involvement C. Clean, Green & Liveable D. Safety, Security & A Visible Presence E. Strengthening The Local Economy |
| F. | | | | | | |
| Impact Of Saving On Corporate Priority | | | Impact Of Saving On Corporate Priority | | | |
| Positive | | | | | | |

| Level Of Impact | | | Level Of Impact | | | F. Decent Homes For All G. Protection Of Children H. Caring For Adults & Older People I. Active, Healthy Citizens J. Inspiring Efficiency, Effectiveness & Equity |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------------|--|--|---|
| High | | | | | | |

Ward/Geographical Implications – State Which Specific Wards Are Directly Affected By This Proposal (In Principle Stage)

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| All Wards: All | If individual wards, please state: |
|--------------------------|---|

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|
| What Is The Expected Impact On Equalities? | | | | | Low/Neutral | |
|---|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|

Level Of Impact – State The Level Of Impact On The Protected Characteristics Below:

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-------------|
| Ethnicity | | | | Low/Neutral |
| Gender | | | | Low/Neutral |
| Age | | | | Low/Neutral |
| Disability | | | | Low/Neutral |
| Religion Or Belief | | | | Low/Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | | Low/Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | | Low/Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation | | | | Low/Neutral |
| Gender Reassignment | | | | Low/Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic, please explain why and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact:

N/A

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| Is A Full Equalities Analysis Assessment Required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|----|--|

6. Legal

State Any Specific Legal Implications Relating To This Proposal

Counsel's opinion on the transfer is as follows:

"In principle, both commercial premises and garages which are let separately from any residential property can be re-appropriated and transferred out of the Council's HRA without the consent of the Secretary of State, on the grounds that they are not a house, part of a house, belonging to a house or enjoyed together with a house. However, the status of each individual property should be verified against those criteria before it is transferred."

| | | | |
|--|----|---|----|
| Is Staff Consultation Required? (Y/N) | No | Is Public Consultation Required? (Y/N) | No |
|--|----|---|----|

7. Human Resources

Will This Saving Proposal Have An Impact On Employees Within The Team? (Y/N) No

Within This Saving Proposal, Please State The Number Of Posts In The Current Structure By Grade Band (FTE Equivalent, Headcount & Vacant)

*(not covered by Council employee e.g. interim)
 ** (covered by Council employee)
 *** (including posts covered by agency – if nil, please state)

| | Scale 1-2 | Scale 3-5 | Scale 6-So2 | Po1-Po5 | Po6-Po8 | SMG1-SMG3 | JNC |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|---------|---------|-----------|-----|
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Headcount | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Gender | Female: | Male: | | |
| Ethnicity | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation | Where Known: | Not Known: | | |

Appendix 1 Section N – Environmental Services

N1: Reduction in maintenance of some small parts, highways & reduced management

| Reduction in Maintenance of some Small Parks, Highways and Reduced Management Costs | |
|---|---|
| Lead officer | Nigel Tyrell |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Customer Services |
| Portfolio | Public Realm |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development |
| Reference no. | N1 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p>Green scene</p> <p>1) Explore the possibility of reducing direct costs by increasing community engagement and involvement in management and maintenance activities in a number of small parks, highways enclosures and closed churchyards.</p> <p>2) Reduce management and management support costs/ posts</p> |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 4,600 | (700) | 3,900 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------|------------------------|------------|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 340 | 0 | 0 | 340 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| The Parks and Open Spaces service within Green Scene. |
| Saving proposal description |
| <p>1. Increase community and voluntary sector engagement and support to explore the possibility of reducing the costs of maintaining some of the boroughs small parks, highways enclosures and closed churchyards. Work with local community groups, residents, parochial church councils and civic amenity groups to identify potential areas. Explore the potential for community groups to source external funds to support new arrangements (£153 k)</p> <p>2..Reduce management and management support costs/ posts (3 posts) £188k</p> |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|---|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would need a further renegotiation of elements of the Green Space contract which may put additional pressure on it's viability . - Depends on appetite and capacity of local groups to take on extra responsibilities - Possible legal challenge from affected Parochial Church Councils - Reduced maintenance regimes may lead to more visible litter, graffiti and increased fly tipping - Unmaintained footpaths , boundary walls , memorials & trees may become hazardous |

4. Impact of proposal

Reduced management structures

- Reduced capacity to engage with the community and user groups;
- Reduced capacity to deliver existing community engagement projects and schemes .
- Reduced capacity and ability to identify and attract new sources of external funding to improve parks and open spaces;
- Reduced service development, contract monitoring and commissioning capacity.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Mitigations

- Potential to increase community involvement and participation in management & maintenance activities
- Parks and open space would remain open .
- Individual Parochial Church Councils may be prepared to carry out some of the maintenance of closed church yards
- Large parks regeneration projects would continue.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| C. | | I. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| | Various wards |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | | Low/ Neutral |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| x | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 6. Legal | | | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | | | |
| Council has a duty of care to ensure all land it manages is not the source of a statutory nuisance | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|-----|---|----|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-----|
| 7. Human Resources | | | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | Yes |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | |
| *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim | | | |
| **(covered by council employee) | | | |
| ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | |

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | 1.1 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 3 | 1 | |
| Head Count | 2 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 3 | 1 | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

| Workforce Profile Information | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Gender: | Female: 14 | | Male: 26 | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 4 | White: 36 | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | 4 | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 18 | | Not Known: 22 | |

N2: Reduction in street cleansing frequency & management costs

| Reduction in Street Cleansing Frequencies and Cleansing Management Costs | |
|--|---|
| Lead officer | Nigel Tyrell |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Customer Services |
| Portfolio | Public Realm |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development |
| Reference no. | N2 |
| Short summary of proposal | Street Management - Reduction in street cleansing frequencies and cleansing management costs. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 7,600 | (1,600) | 6,000 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 400 | 0 | 0 | 400 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| Street sweeping service |
| Saving proposal description |
| 1. Reduce street sweeping frequencies across the borough. No of posts affected 14 £0.34m - There will be a reduction in the frequencies that we sweep all residential roads which will result in a build up of litter, detritus and weeds. Streets will be unswept for longer periods. 2..Reduce senior management post £0.06m |

| 4. Impact of proposal |
|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: |
| 1a. Increase in complaints and customer / residents dissatisfaction with service 1b. Un-swept streets look unsightly and have an impact on the environment. There would be a heavy build up of litter and detritus. Cleanliness as standards could be significantly reduced. 1c. Possible increase in trips and falls leading to increase in insurance claims. 2. Council will lose the services of experienced officer |
| Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these. |
| Possible increase in trips and falls leading to increase in insurance claims. Un-swept streets look unsightly and have an impact on the environment. There could be a heavy build up of litter and detritus. Cleanliness as standards would be significantly reduced and the council may be unable to comply with set time frames within Environmental Protection Act . |

4. Impact of proposal

Authorities that allow their land to fall below acceptable standards for longer than the allowed response time may be subject to a Litter Abatement Order (section 91) or a Litter Abatement Notice (section 92) issued under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Performance will decline pushing the authority into the bottom quartile. This will be because the work undertaken in high intensity use areas will have to be undertaken as a priority. Areas that are already under performing such as 'Other Highways', 'High and Low Density Housing' and 'Industry', are likely to suffer as a result.

A full reorganisation of all sweeping beats in the borough would have to be carried out due to reduction in frequencies.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| C. | | D. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|---|
| All | Will have a larger impact on wards in North of the borough as these sweeping beats were less affected in the last reorganisation of sweeping frequencies. |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------|--|--|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | Medium | | | |
|--|--|--|--------|--|--|--|

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

| |
|---|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: |
| Impact will affect all groups equally |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|----------|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | x |
|---|--|--|-----------|----------|

| |
|--|
| 6. Legal |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal |
| Yes – Environmental Protection Act 1990 |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|-----|---|----|

| |
|---------------------------|
| 7. Human Resources |
|---------------------------|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Yes |
|--|-----|

| |
|---|
| <p>Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)</p> <p>*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim</p> <p>** (covered by council employee)</p> <p>*** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state</p> <p>(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)</p> |
|---|

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | 95.6 | 35 | 3 | 15 | | 1 | |
| Head Count | 96 | 35 | 3 | 15 | | 1 | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| Workforce Profile Information |
|--------------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Gender: | Female: 4 | Male: 146 | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 37 | White: 100 | Other: 3 | Not Known: 10 |
| Disability: | 11 | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 96 | | Not Known: 54 | |

Appendix 1 Section O – Public Services

O1: End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme

| End the Discretionary Freedom Pass Scheme | |
|---|---|
| Lead officer | Ralph Wilkinson |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Customer Services |
| Portfolio | Resources |
| Select Committee | Safer Stronger |
| Reference no. | O1 |
| Short summary of proposal | End the discretionary Freedom Pass scheme The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 5. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: Public Services (Benefits) | | |
| Expenditure | Income | Net Budget |
| 262.273 (253.762) | 256.804 (246.789) | 5.469 (6.973) |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | |
|---|----------|------------|------------------------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: |
| 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No |
| | | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | |
| | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| The Council issues Freedom Passes (FP) to all residents who meet the national eligibility criteria in relation to age or disability. In addition, discretionary Freedom Passes are issued to those residents who do not meet the national criteria and currently 1,175 people are in receipt of such passes - 75% (or 878 clients) due to mental health difficulties and 25% (397) due to physical disabilities. |
| Saving proposal description |
| The proposal is to withdraw the discretionary FP with effect from 1 January 2015. As the cost is based on usage it is difficult to be precise about exactly how much could be saved but estimates suggest the saving would be in excess of £200k pa. Although withdrawing the discretionary FPs will impact on some households, there are 2 alternative schemes that would negate the impact and are at no cost to the Council. |
| JC+ travel discount card – This is available to residents who have been unemployed for 3 months and over, received a qualifying benefit or must be working with an advisor for a return to work, they will be able to apply for a concession that gives them half-price travel; |
| 60+ London Oyster card – This is available to residents who live in a London borough, are over the age of 60 but who do not qualify for a FP and they will qualify for free travel. |
| A recent sampling of those residents currently receiving a discretionary FP suggested that 68% would qualify for an alternative concession, this being 63% who would qualify for the JC+ travel discount card and 5% for the 60+ London Oyster card. |
| There are 17 London boroughs that have a discretionary FP scheme although some no longer issue any new passes. |

The remaining 16 don't have a discretionary FP scheme. Locally, Lambeth withdrew their discretionary scheme in 2012 and Greenwich are reviewing theirs now.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Based on sampling 68% would have a change in their entitlement to free travel and 32% would lose their entitlement to free travel.

The service is working with the Community Services Directorate to try and establish whether the loss of entitlement to free travel would impact on other services that might increase costs to the Council.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

The saving impacts on other services – this may happen where the withdrawal of the FP means the person becomes reliant on other Council services. To determine if this is likely to be the case a set of sample cases is with the Community Services Directorate for consideration.

The saving is not achieved because it was an estimate – the saving is based on average usage so should be reasonably accurate. However, charging is done in arrears so there may be an issue with timing where the saving is not achieved in year 1. The timing / charging mechanism is being reviewed and discussed with London Councils who oversee the scheme.

Council reputation – communications will need to explain the reason for the change in policy. Not all London boroughs offer a discretionary scheme and of those that do some have withdrawn them or are reviewing them.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|----------|--|--|--|--|
| H. | | | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact on equalities? | High | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|--|------|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ neutral |
| Disability: | High | | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

There will be a high impact on persons with a disability as it withdraws their current entitlement to free travel. Sampling shows that 68% of these will be entitled to alternative travel concessions. The remaining 32% will no longer have support. Information will be provided to all about alternatives and most economic ways to use public transport.

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

The savings here being proposed are within the context of "discretionary" expenditure. The issue will therefore be to address the risks within the context of the service users. A full equalities review is needed if the Council is to avoid a successful challenge

| | | | |
|---|----|---|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|---|----|---|-----|

7. Human Resources

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | | No |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | |
| *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim | | | | | | | |
| **(covered by council employee) | | | | | | | |
| ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |
| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |
| Workforce Profile Information | | | | | | | |
| Gender: | Female: | | | Male: | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | | Not Known: | | |
| Disability: | | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | Not Known: | | | |

O2: Reduction in staffing for parking contract client team

| Reduction in Staffing for Parking Contract Client Team | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Lead officer | Ralph Wilkinson |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Customer Services |
| Portfolio | Resources |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts |
| Reference no. | O2 |
| Short summary of proposal | Review Parking Contract Client Team |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure: | Income £m | Net Budget £m |
| 2,300 | (7,200) | (5,100) |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | |
| 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA |
| | | | | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| N/A | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal | |
|--|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed | |
| The Parking Client Unit monitors the council's parking contract. | |
| Saving proposal description | |
| Deletion of 1 post | |

| 4. Impact of proposal | |
|---|--|
| Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services: | |
| The contract is now entering it's second year and will no longer be subject to the same level of risk by the time this proposal is implemented. There should be no impact on the effectiveness of the monitoring arrangements by this time. | |
| No impact on the management of the contract, | |
| Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these. | |
| | |

| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Main Priority – Most Relevant | Secondary Priority | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement |
| C. | D. | |
| Impact of saving on corporate | Impact of saving on corporate | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|------------------------|--|---------|--|
| Impact on Corporate Priorities: | | | | | | |
| priority | | | priority | | | C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
| | | Neutral | | | Neutral | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | | Low | | | Low | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage | |
| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
| N/A | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|----|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| 6. Legal | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| None | |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|----|---|----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| 7. Human Resources | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Yes |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | |

*(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Head Count | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: 4 | | Male: 0 | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 3 | White: 1 | Other: 0 | | Not Known: 0 | | |
| Disability: | N/A | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 3 | | | Not Known: 1 | | | |

O3: Set up an internal 'enforcement agency' to collect Council Tax & other debts

| Set up an Internal 'Enforcement Agency' (bailiff) Service to Collect Council Tax and Other Debts | |
|--|---|
| Lead officer | Ralph Wilkinson |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Customer Services |
| Portfolio | Resources |
| Select Committee | Public Accounts |
| Reference no. | O3 |
| Short summary of proposal | Set up an internal 'enforcement agency' (bailiff) service to collect Council Tax and other debts. The internal bailiff service will generate income from the statutory fees charged to debtors. The 'saving' is the net surplus income once operational costs have been taken into account. |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: Division (Revenues) | | |
| Expenditure | Income | Net Budget |
| 262.273 (3.553) | 256.804 (1.781) | 5.469 (1.771) |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 400 | 200 | 0 | 600 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>The Revenues Service is responsible for the annual collection of £105m Council Tax, £55m Business Rates, sundry debt and the payments centre. If a Council Tax/Business Rates payer does not pay the Council goes to court and obtains a liability order which allows further enforcement action. The default collection method for these cases is to pass the cases to a bailiff to collect.</p> <p>The Council has contracts with a number bailiff companies to collect the outstanding debt. The bailiff companies do not charge the Council for the service as they generate their income/profit from the fees charged to debtors.</p> <p>The service will also be extended to cover outstanding Parking PCN debt (£3m p.a.)</p> |
| Saving proposal description |
| <p>The Tribunal Courts and Enforcement Act 2007, together with the enabling regulations, came into force in April 2014 and brought major changes to the enforcement industry to make it simpler to understand and more transparent. The reforms introduce a new fixed fee regime for debtors and changed the name of bailiffs to enforcement agents. A review of the changes shows that a substantial amount of income will be generated from the new fixed fees which with the current arrangements would become additional profit for the bailiff companies. The saving proposal is to set up an internal 'enforcement agency' (bailiff) service which after taking into account running costs will generate a net surplus income.</p> <p>In addition to generating surplus income the service believes it can improve upon the current bailiff collection rate and provide a more sensitive service when vulnerable debtors are identified.</p> |

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

A team of enforcement agents and support staff will be recruited to deliver the service that was previously delivered by a contractor.

Service users will experience the same or a better level of service as the Council believes it will be better at identifying and dealing with vulnerable cases.

There should be no negative impact on the voluntary sector or other services.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Does not generate the income expected – the proposed income generation is a safe estimate. However, the Council will retain the existing bailiff services for out of borough cases and ‘difficult’ cases so will be able to revert to external service again at short notice. Staff employed will be on fixed term contracts until the service is confident in its future. Close monitoring of expenditure and income will be carried out throughout the process.

Does not improve Council Tax/Business Rate collection – even if the new service only collects 20% of the debt referred the objectives of generating income from fees and being more sensitive will be achieved. The enforcement agents recruited will be experienced and currently delivering this type of service elsewhere. If the collection rate is less than 20% the option to revert to external bailiff company at short notice is possible.

Damages council reputation – the Council is already associated with this type of service by contract. Bringing the service in house under the Council’s direct management and introducing a more sensitive approach for vulnerable cases should ensure the Council’s reputation is maintained or improved.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--------|--|--|--|--|
| J. | | | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| All Wards : All | If individual Wards, please state: |
|---------------------------|---|

5. Service Equalities Impact

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|
| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 6. Legal | | | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | | | |
| None (check does TUPE apply?) | | | |

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | No | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|----|---|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| 7. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | | No |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | |
| *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim | | | | | | | |
| **(covered by council employee) | | | | | | | |
| ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |
| | Scale 1 – 2 | Scale 3 – 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
| FTE | | | | | | | |
| Head Count | | | | | | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Workforce Profile Information | | | | |
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | |

Appendix 1 Section P – Planning Service

P1: Restructure of the planning service

| Restructure of Planning Service | |
|--|--|
| Lead officer | John Miller |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Resources and Regeneration |
| Portfolio | Planning Service |
| Select Committee | Sustainable Development |
| Reference no. | P1 |
| Short summary of proposal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restructure of planning service (£128k) to enable us to build flexible, well trained Planning Casework teams that can respond to fluctuations in caseload. Cutting funding for legal locum to deal with s106 agreements that is no longer required (£51k) |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000's | Income £000's | Net Budget £000's |
| 3,394 | (1,577) | 1,817 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------|------------------------|------------|-----------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 229 | 0 | 0 | 229 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed |
| <p>The Planning Service forms part of the Resources and Regeneration Directorate and operates from 3rd Floor Laurence House. The Planning Service currently comprises: Forward Planning, Urban Design and Conservation, Development Management, Land Charges and Economic Development.</p> <p>This saving proposal affects the Development Management area of the Planning Service. <i>Development Management</i> deals with individual planning applications within the policy framework set by the development plan, as well as appeals against Council decisions, and enforcement action against unauthorised development.</p> <p>The Planning Service was last re-structured in September 2011 to facilitate a Development Management approach to the handling of planning applications and to integrate the administration functions within the Area teams to reduce fragmentation of the planning application process. The implementation of this vision required a more proactive and delivery focused approach, with more resources needed to be allocated to pre-application discussions with applicants and the local community. Closer and more flexible working was also required between the planning officer, technical support and enforcement functions to enable the service to be more efficient and effective.</p> |
| Saving proposal description |
| <p>Savings proposal is split into 2 areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A staff re-structure that will further embed the principles of Development Management and the recent changes to our "Development" pre-application services. Whenever possible, we will seek to influence the design of |

3. Description of service and proposal

potential developments earliest possible stage, so that when an application is submitted it can be determined efficiently based on our earlier advice. Applications will be processed effectively by the appropriately graded planning officers. Wherever possible, case officers will be fully responsible for all aspects of the processing of their application.

2. A management re-structure
3. Removal of £51k from the Development Management budget which was used to support a legal locum providing specific Planning advice on the setting up of legal agreements. Funding arrangements for provision of internal legal advice is now recovered via Section 106 Agreements.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

1. Planning Case Officers will have more input and control into the quality and processing timescales of their individual caseloads. A larger percentage of Planning decisions will be issued within published timescales. Residents and other professional bodies will be able to contact their Planning Officer for the majority of aspects of their application. Clearer career paths in place for Planning Service staff.
2. There is no impact on any stakeholders to the removal of the Locum support as internal legal fees will be recovered through Section 106 agreements.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

No significant risks arise with these proposals.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--------|--|--|---------|--|
| J. | | E. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| Positive | | | | Neutral | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | | Low | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact | | | Medium | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--------|--|--|
| | | | | | |

| 5. Service Equalities Impact | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| on equalities? | | | | | |

| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
|---|------|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | Medium | |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: | High | | |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| <p>The re-structure of the Planning Service is likely to impact the older members of the team. The current staff profile has 50% of the workforce aged 41 and over, with 25% aged 51 and over. 38% of the workforce is BME – all graded at PO1 and below.</p> | | | |

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | YES | <p>As this savings proposal has staffing implications, the service will be required to undertake an equalities analysis assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process. This is stipulated within the Council’s Employment/Change Management policies. As part of their operational business processes, the service will monitor the impact of any staffing implications on service delivery and where necessary, take action to mitigate any resultant impacts.</p> |
|---|-----|---|

| 6. Legal | |
|---|--|
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | |
| <p>This proposal is subject to staff consultation as stipulated within the Council’s Employment/Change Management policies.</p> | |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | No |
|---|-----|---|----|

This proposal is subject to staff consultation as stipulated within the Council’s Employment/Change Management policies.

| 7. Human Resources | |
|--|-----|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Yes |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | |
| <p>* (not covered by council employee) e.g. interim ** (covered by council employee) *** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state</p> | |

7. Human Resources

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | 7 | 11 | 21 | 3.93 | 1 | |
| Head Count | | 2 | 8 | 17 | 3 | 1 | |
| Vacant* | | NIL | NIL | NIL | NIL | | |
| Vacant** | | 4 | 1 | 2 | NIL | | |
| Vacant*** | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Gender: | Female: 20 | | Male: 17 | | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 13 | White: 22 | Other: 0 | Not Known: 2 | | | |
| Disability: | 1 | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: 9 – Straight / Heterosexual | Not Known: 28 | | | | | |

Appendix 1 Section Q – Safeguarding & Early Intervention Services

Q1: Improve triage for Children’s Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer

| Improving Triage for Children's Social Care Services and Redesigning Children's Centre and Early Intervention Offer | |
|--|---|
| Lead officer | Ian Smith |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Children & Young People |
| Portfolio | Children & Young People |
| Select Committee | Children & Young People |
| Reference no. | Q1 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p>These proposals involve a re alignment of the Early Intervention and Social Care Referral and Assessment functions to create a new approach to our front door and triage for access to services. Early Intervention Services have been moved into Children Social Care (CSC) to ready both services for more integration leading to fewer assessments which should allow us to reduce staffing levels. This strand also proposes alternative delivery models and levels of provision across our early intervention providers in Children’s Centres, Targeted Family Support (TFS) and the Family Intervention Project (FIP) to build in greater flexibility to work at lower costs. It proposes a reduction in the unit costs of working with families and a reduction by a third of the number of families we support. Greater use of the Troubled Families grant with these families will deliver further savings to the General Fund. The strand also proposes further savings to the Children’s Social Care placement and other budgets. In this strand, savings proposals of £5.5m are set out, of which £4.18m is proposed for 2015/16; £1.2m for 2016/17 and £111k for 2017/18.</p> <p>In 2015/16, £3.2m of the savings in this strand is required in order to re-set the Children’s Social Care placements budget as set out in CYP14/15.02b</p> <p>The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 6.</p> |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000’s | Income £000’s | Net Budget £000’s |
| 26,215 | 0 | 26,215 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000’s) | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | |
| 4,181 of which 3.2m relates to the re-setting of the CSC Placements budget as set out in CYP14/15.02b | 1,223 | 111 | 5,515 | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | |
| N/A | | | | |

3. Description of service and proposal

3. Description of service and proposal

Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed

Early Intervention (EI) services work directly with families and/or practitioners in order to support the identification, assessment and addressing of key needs to improve parenting and outcomes for children. EI services also aim to prevent the escalation to specialist services, such as children's social care. Children's Social Care protect vulnerable children from harm and comprise services for LAC, placements, initial contacts, referrals and assessment, adoption, family social work – front line protection work, and children subject to a child protection plan. A recent realignment of EI and Children's Social Care (CSC) within the CYP directorate was undertaken to allow integration which will help to reduce the number of assessments that end in no further action and therefore reduce costs.

Saving proposal description

The proposals in this strand are five-fold:

- 1 Introducing Integrated Triage into Children's Social Care
- 2 Changing children centre contracts as they are re-procured to:
 - A shift the costs of providing reception and administration
 - B reduce the unit cost of working with each family
 - C reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third
- 3 In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts re-configure Children's Centres to be more flexible and focused
- 4 Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work
- 5 Savings to other CSC budgets

1 Introducing Integrated Triage into Children's Social Care

This will require reform of the Front Door in Children's Social Care. Details are still being developed, including the necessary cultural change that will be required across the children's partnership. It is proposed to implement the changes so that they are effective by October 2015. The savings in this area will accrue from an expected reduction in the number of assessments that are undertaken for which there is no further action. This will allow the deletion of a social work team and the early intervention team supporting the partnership in the use of the common assessment form. In the future, cases will be more effectively "triaged" and passed directly to the right services, thereby reducing the number of assessments by about 15%. Currently, over 3000 assessments are done each year and 75% of these do not result in further action. This new approach is not without risk and will be closely monitored. It will also require additional work with partners in schools, Children Centres, health and the police to build capacity for the partnership to support children and families.

The expected saving of £510k is spread over 2015/16 and 2016/17 with £255k expected in each year.

2 Changing Children Centre contracts as they are re-procured.

2a removing the requirement for reception and administration

The Children's Centre contracts are due for renewal as at 31st March 2015. The LA currently retains responsibility for the administration and management of all 17 premises partly to ensure the hours of opening are consistent with a universal service as part of OFSTED expectations/ definitions. This costs £500k. By implementing a new model of delivery of Children's Centres (as described below) this cost will be saved through the more flexible use of the buildings. The expectation in tendering would be that the successful contractor(s) would not be required to have specific reception or administration offices and they could provide this in a more flexible way as they consider necessary. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015, a saving of £250k would arise in 2015/16 and £250K in 2016/17.

2b reduce the unit cost of working with each family

The providers under the current contracts have showed varied success in terms of meeting targets and demonstrating value for money. The overall average unit cost we currently pay is £579 per family. The average unit cost of the top 4 performing Children's Centres is £462, and it is proposed to reduce the unit cost across all sites to this amount, thus achieving a £644k saving. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015 a saving of £322k would arise in 2015/16 and £322k in 2016/17.

2c reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third

3. Description of service and proposal

Given the savings required, it will not be possible to sustain work with the number of families currently receiving a service. The proposal is therefore to reduce the expected volumes of targeted families receiving a service. Using the above reduced unit cost of £462, a saving of £792k would mean that 3800 families could be reached. This is 1700 fewer targeted families than the 5500 who are currently targeted to receive a service. Although this is a reduction in number, it can be mitigated by maintaining and developing alignment of health visiting delivery to children's centre provision. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015 a saving of £396k would arise in 2015/16 and a further £396k in 2016/17.

3 In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts, re-configure Children's Centres to be more flexible and focused

For the above proposals to be taken forward, it would be necessary to change the existing model of delivery, in order that the Children Centres remain viable. Under the current Children Centre regime, all centres are required by OFSTED to :

- be open, and staffed, 9am-5pm, 5 days a week
- open 48 weeks a year
- be subject to inspection
- comply with an extensive set of data and monitoring requirements
- provide a range of services as specified by statute

The proposal is to re-designate our Children's Centres so that some or all are freed from these requirements so that they can operate more flexibly and at lower cost. Collectively across the Estate, all services currently being offered would still be available but they could be configured differently.

Proposals are still being designed and, the savings would need to be subject to consultation with parents, professionals and others, including the voluntary sector. The new model will require closer working with health visitors, in particular.

4 Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work

The FIP is used extensively with challenging families by CSC and in delivering work aligned with the Government's Troubled Families programme. The current cost of the service is £488k pa, £200k of which is already funded through Troubled Families. There is scope to fund the whole cost of the service – a further £288k - using Troubled Families grant.

Similarly, the Targeted Family Support Service works with vulnerable families as part of early intervention. The new criteria for phase 2 of the Troubled Families programme is likely to align more with our approach and there is scope therefore to fund more of our early intervention work through the Troubled Families grant - an additional £1.1m.

5 Savings to other Children's Social Care budgets

5 a) Section 20s

Half of our children becoming LAC result from s20 or parents giving up their children to social care (125 or half of the 250 that became LAC in 2012/13) and half of those who leave care are returning to their families (approximately another 125 of the 240 who left care in 2012/13 but not the same 125 each year). The proposal is to apply resources to crisis response activities that could avoid some of these particular children coming into the care system. The proposal is that 6 children each year are supported with this crisis response activity to remain with their families with an average cost avoided per case of £30k, a total of £180k for the proposal.

5 b) Residential Placements

Trying to reduce the more expensive residential placements has been a core strategy for CSC savings for a number of years. With cases becoming more complex, this has become more challenging with an increase in our residential placements in the last year. This proposal is to address the recent increase by using use care planning panel to review 12 cases and reduce residential placements costs to generate £500k in a full year.

5 c) Existing Internal Foster Carers and Expansion Programme

There is an ongoing strategy to increase the ratio of in-house as against Independent Fostering Agency (IFA) providers. The target is 20 in 2014/15. If the target is continued for 2015/16 but assuming 5 of those are specialist

3. Description of service and proposal

roles then that leaves 15 more to achieve a saving of c£25k per placement or £375k saving.

5 d) Long Term Challenging Placements

The recruitment of specialist professional foster carers could be a route to support more difficult young people in some of our most expensive accommodation. This proposal, as part of growing our in-house capacity, is to recruit 5 specialist foster carers who would support those young people with very expensive placements costing in the region of £3k a week. This alternative proposal would be to pay £800 for fostering costs plus say, £800 for additional support, giving a total of £1600 instead of the £3000. Assuming 4 placements using these specialist carers, then a £290k saving would result. This would be in addition to the activity on residential placements set out above.

5 e) Supported Lodgings

This is accommodation in a family home but not as a fostering placement. It tends to be for over 18s and some young people about to leave care. It is a much cheaper option than semi-independent units The weekly saving is estimated at £300 per week or £15k per annum. It is anticipated that 10 young people could be accommodated in this way resulting in a saving of £150k. The organisation that recruits in-house foster carers for the Council has indicated that they could assist in securing this accommodation.

5 f) Additional savings have been identified in Children's Social Care – one ICS floorwalker post to be deleted on the basis of all new staff will be trained in an ICS system before they join Lewisham (£45k). The interpreting budget is also under spending by £30k so this will be added to the savings for 2015/15.

5 g) The management of the FIP and TFS now also lie within Children Social Care (CSC) facilitating better transfer of cases between CSC and early intervention services. This will facilitate a reduction in Children in Need Plans held by social workers and a reduced cost. Initial work suggests that up to £111k could be saved. This saving will not be achievable until 2017/18. These are some of the most vulnerable children in Lewisham and in order to achieve a decrease in social workers working with these families, we would want to be confident that we have built capacity in the partnership including our commissioned services, to hold these cases.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Impacts from Children's Centre Proposals:

- A reduction potentially of 1700 families supported by Children's Centres with fewer services available
- The integrated triage should simplify the system for professionals and families to know where to get support

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

- Reducing capacity in the CCs will increase demand / expectation in the health visiting services (the budget for which will transfer to LAs in 2015).
- The partnership may not have the capacity to pick up cases leading to pressures Children's Social Care. This is to be mitigated by training and by linking social workers to provision in each children centre services area of the borough.
- Children's Centres may see more demand following reduced contacts elsewhere such as CSC, FIP, TFS and the youth service, where there is also proposed resources cuts. To mitigate this the services will need to ensure that they are identifying and supporting the vulnerable families and those most in need of help.
- Fewer assessments by social workers could bring an increased risk of safeguarding failure – ensure training and support available so that staff can identify the correct cases for referrals so system is safe rather than risk averse.
- The use of Troubled Families Grant to support activity would potentially lead to the loss of these services if Government were in the future to end the Troubled Families programme and its funding rather than mainstream the funding within local government
- If procurement changes are not achieved the budget for placements will significantly over spend in 2015/16
- Increased possibility of placement breakdown for more challenging children if specialist foster carers are not successful

4. Impact of proposal

- Loss of social workers may impact morale although it is intended to redeploy social workers internally.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | Corporate Priorities:- | |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| G. | | B. | | A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact on equalities? | High | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|------|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: (Young People) | High | | |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |

If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact :

N/A

| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|
| | | | | |

6. Legal

State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal

6. Legal

X

Is staff consultation required (Y/N)

Yes

Is public consultation required (Y/N)?

Yes

7. Human Resources

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)?

Yes

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)

***(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim**

**** (covered by council employee)**

***** (including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state**

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | 8 | | 10 | 1 | | |
| Head Count | | 8 | | 10 | 1 | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

Workforce Profile Information

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender: | Female: | Male: | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | |
| | | | | |

Q1 – supplementary - Improve triage for Children’s Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer

| Early Intervention and Safeguarding | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Lead officer | Ian Smith |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Children & Young People |
| Portfolio | Children & Young People |
| Select Committee | Children & Young People |
| Reference no. | Q1 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p>The budgets for Looked After Children placements, supporting adopted children and placements for Care Leavers needs to be re-set. While the numbers in these categories are not growing, the budgets do not reflect the actual numbers of children and young people who need to be supported. The Directorate for Children and Young People has, in previous years, covered the gaps through various management actions but the savings made in previous years mean that there is no longer the flexibility for those actions to cover the gaps. That has led to the current in-year overspend in the Children’s Social Care placements budget. In order to re-set the budget, further savings of £3.2m have had to be found. It is proposed that these savings come from the early intervention and safeguarding review strand as set out in CYP14/15.02a</p> <p>The consultation report for this proposal is provided at Appendix 7.</p> |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000’s) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: | | |
| Expenditure £000’s | Income £000’s | Net Budget £000’s |
| 23,194 | 0 | 23,194 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000’s) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| 3,208 | 0 | 0 | 3,208 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal | |
|--|--|
| Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed | |
| The re-setting of the children social care placements budgets is being achieved by a review of the approaches to the procurement of places for looked after children, transformation of the front door for contact with social care and a re-organisation of the early intervention services as set out in Pro Forma XX. | |
| Saving proposal description | |
| The proposals in this strand are five-fold as set out in the Pro Forma relating to safeguarding and early intervention: | |
| 1 | Introducing Integrated Triage into Children’s Social Care |
| 2 | Changing children centre contracts as they are re-procured to: |
| A | shift the costs of providing reception and administration |
| B | reduce the unit cost of working with each family |
| C | reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third |
| 3 | In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts, re-configure Children’s Centres to be more flexible and focused |

3. Description of service and proposal

- 4 Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work
 5 Savings to other CSC budgets

The proposals to provide the resources for the re-setting of the Children's Social Care budget are set out in CYP14/15.02b. £3.2m of the £4.2 m set out there are proposed to be used in this area.

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people's achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|
| G. | | B. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | Negative | | |
| Level of Impact | | Level of Impact | | | |
| | Medium | | Medium | | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact on equalities? | | | | | Low/ neutral | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|------|--|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Gender: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Age: (Young People) | High | | |
| Disability: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Sexual Orientation: | | | Low/ Neutral |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| N/A | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | | | No | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 6. Legal | | | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | | | |
| X | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|---|-----|---|-----|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| 7. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | | | | | | YES | |
| Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant) | | | | | | | |
| *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim | | | | | | | |
| **(covered by council employee) | | | | | | | |
| ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state | | | | | | | |
| (HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available) | | | | | | | |
| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
| FTE | | 8 | | 10 | 1 | | |
| Head Count | | 8 | | 10 | 1 | | |
| Vacant* | | | | | | | |
| Vacant** | | | | | | | |
| Vacant*** | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Workforce Profile Information | | | | |
| Gender: | Female: | | Male: | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: | White: | Other: | Not Known: |
| Disability: | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | Not Known: | |

Q2: Reduction in Youth Service provision

| Reduction in Youth Service Provision | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Lead officer | Mervyn Kaye |
| Directorates affected by proposal | Children and Young People |
| Portfolio | Children and Young People |
| Select Committee | Children and Young People |
| Reference no. | Q2 |
| Short summary of proposal | <p>Two options are presented for consideration. Both options propose savings of £1.4m initially. It is important strategically to set an end option for the youth service due to further Council funding reductions required in following years.</p> <p>Option 1 looks at an option of mutualisation of the youth service following savings. Option 2 considers a move straight away to a statutory service only model.</p> |

| 1. Financial information | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------|------------|
| 2014/15 BUDGET (£000's) | | |
| Net Controllable Budget: £3,460.8 | | |
| Expenditure | Income | Net Budget |
| 3,603 | (143) | 3,460 |

| 2. Value of Proposals per year (£000's) | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|--|-----|----|
| 2015/16: | 2016/17: | 2017/18: | Total 2015/16-2017/18: | | |
| <u>Option 1:</u> 1,406 | 0 | 0 | 1,406* | | |
| <u>Option 2:</u> 3,160 | 0 | 0 | *A further saving of 1,754 from 2019/20 is proposed after 3 years of the mutual operating (See text for the risks) £3,160 | | |
| Does this proposal have an impact on the DSG or HRA? | | DSG | No | HRA | No |
| If the proposal has an impact on the DSG or HRA, please describe the impact below | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |

| 3. Description of service and proposal |
|---|
| <p>Description of the service, functions or activities which are being reviewed</p> <p>Lewisham Council's Youth Service budget covers a two-pronged statutory obligation: facilitate access to positive activities for young people to build life skills, and track young people's current education and employment statuses in order to report to Central Government the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) and then ensure these young people receive appropriate support.</p> <p>The Youth Service provides and facilitates access to a range of activities for young people through a combination of direct delivery, support to access delivery provided by other organisations, and commissioning and partnering with the voluntary sector. The activities are now focused on developing young people's life skills as agreed in the previous reorganisation of the service.</p> <p>Provision includes positive activities for young people, offering them places to go and things to do, including social and cultural activities, sports and play, and early intervention services. The Youth Service also offers informal education, advice and guidance on career choices and healthier lifestyles, and information concerning the dangers of substance misuse.</p> <p>The Service's targeted support for young people in relation to education, employment and training consists of 9</p> |

3. Description of service and proposal

specialist one to one youth workers each holding an approximate caseload of 15 cases at any one time, with an annual service reach of around 270 young people. Alongside a one stop shop, Baseline, in Lewisham town centre and a variety of commissioned providers, the service provides one-to-one youth work for the Borough's most vulnerable, support to young fathers, young women and those considering their sexuality. Additionally, the Mayor's NEET Programme offers a 6 week traineeship programme for young people who are not in education, employment or training.

All of these activities and support systems take place at 7 Council-run youth centres, 5 Council-run adventure playgrounds, through street based work, at Baseline – our one-stop support hub in Lewisham Town Centre – and at a variety of non-council run venues across the Borough.

Saving proposal description

In this section both options are described and the details of the initial £1.4m saving proposals are set out

Option 1

It is proposed that the Service reduces its controllable budget by £1.4m (41%) by making strategic adjustments to several service areas. The proposals set out below reduce the size and capacity of the service in order to release savings, but also leave a model which it is believed could be used as the basis of the development of a Staff Mutual proposal for the service. If a staff mutual proposal is pursued, it is estimated that a lead-in time of a year would be needed to establish a viable business plan, and then a period of three years of council funding. More work is needed on various aspects of the mutual as indicated. This includes whether it would be possible to taper the council's funding over three year period. The proposal is the Council should stop funding the mutual entirely after the third year, generating a further £1.7m saving. There is a risk that the mutual will not at the end of 3 years, be sustainable and therefore a risk, that without continuing Council funding at some level, services cannot be guaranteed.

Option 2

Given the extent of savings required by the Council and the risk that option 1 could still require Council funding after a mutual has been in operation for three years, option 2 proposes moving directly to a statutory service model only. Under the model, £100k would be needed to facilitate access to youth activity and £200k would be needed for the NEET tracking and engagement elements of the youth re-engagement services.

This would produce a saving of £3.1m

Proposals to achieve the initial savings of £1.4m

Staffing:

The Youth Service currently maintains 7 youth centres and 5 adventure playgrounds (APGs). At each of the youth centre sites the Service delivers 15 contact hours per week and 22.5 hours per week at each adventure playground (217.5 contact hours across all sites). In order to release savings across the Service it is proposed that the Service retains 5 youth centres and 5 APGs, while removing staff from 2 youth centres and reducing front-line staff headcount commensurately. Removing staff from these sites will allow the 2 centres to be operated by voluntary/community providers or to close. Recommendations as to which two centres should be closed or offered to the voluntary sector will be based on the location of the centre and the attractiveness of the facilities for mutualisation. Currently proposals are to close or pass on Ladywell and Rockbourne youth centres.

From its youth centres, the Service operates a street-based outreach capacity comprised of 3.4 fte support youth workers with an ability to operate 15 hours of outreach work per week. It is proposed that the Service remove this capacity.

Ending Council-run provision at 2 youth centres and ending the street-based outreach capacity will yield the following savings:

- Reduction of Youth Workers from 17.5fte to 10 fte, and reduction of manager and business support

3. Description of service and proposal

capacity yields a savings of **£370,000**

- Youth Service provision budget will be reduced commensurate with the removal of staff from two clubs, and with activity already due to end, yielding a saving of **£20,500**

Commissioning:

In order to release further budget savings, but still maintain the Service's integral relationship with the community and voluntary sector, it is proposed that the commissioning fund be reduced by 31%. The commissioning fund is used to procure a broad range of activities focused on building life skills for young people from the voluntary sector that serve to supplement the Youth Service's direct delivery and ensure a range of youth provision across the borough.

Reducing commissioning funds by 31% will release savings of **£293,000**.

Database, IT & Logistics:

Further savings through reduced sites and further efficiencies can be made to IT and database costs, giving a figure of **£35,500**.

Income Generation

It is recommended that significant effort is made to rent space and bring in providers to use our sites during non-contact hours to generate income of **£100,000**

Re-engagement Service

There are three elements of our current service which we propose to bring together more strategically to form a youth re-engagement service. These comprise

- a) Specialist 1:1 Service
- b) The Mayor's NEET Programme
- c) The NEET tracking service
- d) Baseline

a) Specialist 1:1 Service:

The proposal is to re-specify this service which could be delivered as part of the Targeted Family Support Service. The Specialist 1:1 Service is operated out of Baseline in Lewisham Town Centre and is comprised of 9 fte Specialist Youth Workers and 1 fte Specialist 1:1 Coordinator, representing a total cost of £450,000. The previous savings outlined reduce management costs leaving Baseline with £390,000. The team works primarily with young people between the ages of 16-18 and offers individual key worker support in emergency situations, signposting to other services, advice, guidance and access to other community services. It is proposed that savings are made as set out and then the reduced services (for the 1:1 service and the Mayor's NEET programme) are funded through grant substitution from the troubled families grant and some income from other sources which are being currently investigated including the Education Funding Agency and Schools.

The **£390,000 will be grant substituted or covered by income from elsewhere.**

b) Mayor's NEET Programme:

The Mayor's NEET Programme (MNP) is operated out of the TNG and is comprised of 1 fte Specialist Group Work Coordinator, 1 fte Senior Youth Worker, 1.2 fte Support Youth Workers. Staffing and programme costs total £197,000.

In order to release savings to the Youth Service, it is proposed that the MNP is re-specified in accordance with Raising the Participation Age(RPA), and funded via alternative monies from schools, colleges and the Education Funding Agency.

The following changes are proposed to the MNP, which will reduce the total cost from £197,000 to £115,000:

3. Description of service and proposal

- Delete the post of Specialist Group Work Coordinator to realise a savings of **£47,000**
- Halve the MNP programme costs from £70,000 to realise an initial savings of **£35,000**
- The reduced MNP will be alternatively funded to release savings of **£115,000**

c) NEET services, including tracking

The Council has a statutory responsibility to monitoring and track NEETs and to support vulnerable NEETs. The revised cost of this activity is £200k.

This would leave a resource of £705k focussed on re-engaging young people.

The total budget reduction to the Youth Service is £1,406,000

The overall funding under the options are as follows:

| | Current budget for youth service and re-engagement services | Proposed starting point for mutual after savings | Proposed budget for re-engagement service after savings | | Proposed budget for statutory element of youth service | | Total Savings |
|----------|---|--|---|----|--|----|---------------|
| Option 1 | £3,460 | £1,754 | 705 | *1 | 100 | *2 | £1,406 |
| Option 2 | £3,460 | N/A | 705 | *1 | 100 | *2 | £3,160 |

Funding Sources

*1 The £705k will be funding from the general fund (£200k) and the remaining from grant substitution or income generation

*2 Funded from the general fund

4. Impact of proposal

Please outline the impact of the changes you propose. Please indicate how the proposal will impact on both staff, service users, voluntary sector and other council services:

- Reduction in directly provided and commissioned youth provision across both youth clubs and outreach/ street based work including the specific removal of Lewisham youth service universal provision at 2 youth clubs.
- One third reduction in the commissioning fund will lessen provision and also require a reprioritisation and reallocation across currently commissioned providers. There are various voluntary sector providers who rely on Council and Youth Service funding to sustain operations and it is likely that some providers will have to either reduce or suspend operations.
- Reduction in business support will lessen the service's capacity to respond to queries, manage invoices, facilitate commissioning processes and perform mapping exercises.
- Failure to find alternative funding would place specialist provision at risk and limit the Service's ability support partnership work and attend inter-agency meetings.

Please outline the risks associated with your proposal and the mitigating actions you are undertaking to manage these.

- Reducing youth worker and site capacity will cause demand to exceed supply, forcing certain sites to absorb the impact that stems from site closures. To mitigate this, the Service proposes that it retain 1 fte Support Youth Worker beyond the minimum in order to provide enhanced staffing when necessary.
- The Service will continue to look elsewhere for alternative ways to generate revenues including rental of space at youth sites and trading of services. Ultimately this could result in the creation of a staff mutual able to better income generate as well potentially lower costs.
- The need for Troubled Families monies to substitute Council expenditures on the MNP and Specialist 1:1 sub-

4. Impact of proposal

service may exceed supply. The Service will consequently look to make either one or both services income generating entities to supplement any grant money received from Troubled Families.

- Reducing the commissioning funds may cause voluntary sector providers to cease operations. In order to mitigate this, it may be possible for officer time and business acumen to be lent to various sector providers in order to help them future plan, re-examine business strategy and look for alternative funding streams.
- If the mutual option is taken there is a risk that it will not succeed in covering its costs at the end of the three years
- As a mutual the council will have reduced control to specify activity.
- There are HR and budget risks associated with establishing a mutual.
- A mutualised service would have to take into account total cost including facilities management, IT, HR, finance support, etc which is currently within corporate budgets outside of the £3.4m controllable youth service budget detailed here.
- If Option 2 were taken and the service reduced to a statutory minimum there could be a lack of opportunities for young people

Impact on Corporate Priorities:

| Main Priority – Most Relevant | | | Secondary Priority | | | Corporate Priorities:- A. Community Leadership and empowerment B. Young people’s achievement and involvement C. Clean, green and liveable D. Safety, security and a visible presence E. Strengthening the local economy F. Decent Homes for all G. Protection of children H. Caring for adults and the older people I. Active, health citizens J. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity |
|--|--------------------|-----|--|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| B. | | | G. | | | |
| Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | Impact of saving on corporate priority | | | |
| | Negative | | | Option 2 Negative | Option 1 Neutral | |
| Level of Impact | | | Level of Impact | | | |
| Option 2 High | Option 1 Medium | Low | | Option 2 Medium | Option 1 Low | |

Ward/Geographical implications – State which specific Wards are directly affected by this proposal In principle stage

| All Wards : | If individual Wards, please state: |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| All | Yes – to be agreed |

5. Service Equalities Impact

| What is the expected impact on equalities? | High | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|
|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|

Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--------|--------------|
| Ethnicity: | | Medium | |
| Gender: | | Medium | |
| Age: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Disability: | | Medium | |
| Religion/Belief: | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Pregnancy/Maternity | | | Low/ Neutral |
| Marriage & Civil Partnerships | | | Low/ Neutral |

| | | | |
|--|--|--------|--------------|
| Level of impact: State the level of impact on the protected characteristics below: | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | | Medium | |
| Gender reassignment | | | Low/ Neutral |
| If your saving proposal has a high impact on groups with a protected characteristic please explain why, and outline what steps have been/will be taken to mitigate such an impact : | | | |
| x | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Is a full equalities analysis assessment required? | Yes | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 6. Legal | | | |
| State any specific Legal Implications relating to this proposal | | | |
| x | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is staff consultation required (Y/N) | Yes | Is public consultation required (Y/N)? | Yes |
|---|-----|---|-----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 7. Human Resources | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees within the team (yes/no)? | Yes | |
|--|-----|--|

Within this savings proposals, please state the number of posts in the current structure by grade band. (FTE equivalent, Head Count & Vacant)
 *(not covered by council employee) e.g. interim
 **(covered by council employee)
 ***(including posts covered by agency) – If nil please state

(HR Advisory Service will provide you with data where this is available)

| | Scale 1 - 2 | Scale 3 - 5 | Scale 6 - SO2 | PO1 – PO5 | PO6 – PO8 | SMG1 – SMG3 | JNC |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| FTE | | 21.06 | 18 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Head Count | | 52 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Vacant* | | ? | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacant** | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacant*** | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Workforce Profile Information | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|--|--------------|
| Gender: | Female: 49 | | | Male: 40 | | | |
| Ethnicity: | BME: 61 | | White: 20 | | Other: 1 | | Not Known: 7 |
| Disability: | 5 | | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation: | Where known: | | | | Not Known: 89 | | |

APPENDIX 2 – Context for Adult Social Care (A) & Supporting People (B)

| REPORT REGARDING SAVINGS | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Report Title | Context for Community Services savings relating to the transformation of Adult Social Care |
| Author | Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services |
| Date | 19 September 14 |

1. Introduction

In continuing the transformation of adult social care services and managing the demand for services, the main focus for the Adult Social Care and the Commissioning Unit continues to be the provision of safe and high quality care to those with eligible needs whilst achieving a reduction in spend.

Supporting this work is the activity within the Adult Integrated Care Programme which seeks, through joint working and the amalgamation of roles and services, to improve service provision, reduce the need for high cost services, release efficiencies and improve user experience and outcomes.

For 15/16, the identified savings will be achieved primarily through ensuring that decisions made in relation to packages of care are undertaken within a clear framework. For 16/17 and beyond, savings will come from the planned activity within the Adult Integrated Care Programme which will deliver effective advice and support for self care, develop and improve access to community based care, and link individuals to community networks of support.

2. Summary of Savings Proposals in Relation to Adult Social Care

| Value of proposals per year (£000s) | | | |
|--|---------|---------|-----------------|
| Area | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | Total 2015-2018 |
| Assessments | 2,680 | 0 | 2,680 |
| Community support services | 250 | 0 | 250 |
| Mental health | 250 | 0 | 250 |
| Public Health | 3,277 | 0 | 3,277 |
| Learning disability | 1,500 | 0 | 1,500 |
| Day services | 1,300 | 0 | 1,300 |
| Sensory services | 150 | 0 | 150 |
| Charging for Adult Non-Residential Care Services | 275 | | 275 |
| Recoupment of health related elements of care | 600 | 0 | 600 |

| Value of proposals per year (£000s) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Area | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | Total 2015-2018 |
| packages / placements | | | |
| Sub total | 10,282 | 0 | 10,282 |
| Supporting People | 1,349 | 1,174 | 2,523 |
| TOTAL | 11,631 | 1,174 | 12,805 |

3. Overview of the Approach

Lewisham is committed to having a structured and fair system of social care, which makes the best use of limited resources to offer residents access to high quality services to meet their care or support needs in a personalised way. The Care Act has introduced new obligations and will increase both the level and complexity of demand in relation to social care services.

The key principles underpinning the approach to the savings proposals are:

- To ensure value for money for all services, while maintaining service quality and a focus on achieving outcomes defined by the service user and where possible providing resources to service users to enable them to purchase their own services (Direct Payments)
- To ensure fairness and equity across the range of needs or conditions
- To work in partnership with the NHS to ensure co-ordinated health and social care services which are person centred
- To develop a range of services aimed at reducing or preventing the need for longer-term care and support.

To achieve efficiencies and to ensure that support and care is provided in a consistent and equitable way for all client groups, we must:

- Encourage people to take more responsibility for their own care and to use their existing resources (financial, social or otherwise) to achieve their stated outcomes. Promoting access to universal services and linking people to support available within their own families and communities will help them help themselves.
- Develop the use of prevention and short term, early intervention services which enable people to maintain and regain independence reducing people's need for and reliance on long term care and support
- Establish different delivery models through outcome based commissioning and market development - enabling people to have more control and choice through personal budgets and direct payments
- Implement an assessment model that takes account of personal assets and the contributions an individual can make to ensure their needs are met in ways which they prefer and choose for themselves
- Ensure all assessment and support planning staff and providers work with service users in ways that reduces dependency and promotes independence, ensures safety and supports recovery
- Ensure the right level of support is offered in the most cost effective way according to a person's assessed eligible needs.

4. Approach to Key Areas of Activity

4.1 Assessment

An assessment is the process of considering a person's circumstances and with them making a decision about whether they need care and support to help them live their day-to-day lives. The Care Act creates a single, clear duty on local authorities to carry out assessments in order to determine whether an adult has needs for care and support.

After conducting the needs assessment, the local authority is required to determine whether the person has eligible needs, using a new national eligibility framework. Local authorities are also required to consider which needs could be met by information and advice or preventative support. People who do not meet the eligibility threshold for services after an assessment will be informed of what support is available to prevent or reduce their ongoing needs.

The Care Act includes a number of new provisions for carers and lowers the threshold for assessment. Local authorities will be required to assess carers on the basis of the appearance of a need for support. Carers will be supported to recognise their own needs and access appropriate support to help ensure a longer and more manageable caring role for their family or support network. Carers will have the right to an assessment of their needs, separate to those of the cared for person, and regardless of eligibility for formal social care input.

The following guiding principles will be applied to the assessment process:

- Reablement and short term focused support will be provided if it is considered it will improve independence and reduce the need for on-going care and support.
- Concerns about social isolation that are identified within the assessment process will be met by identifying opportunities to alleviate these within the community, unless risks are identified that require a more supportive setting.
- If the individual is in receipt of a mobility related welfare benefit, for example DLA Mobility, they will be expected to apply these to access community based services, attendance at day services, or for travel to and from residential respite. If the service user has not applied for such benefits they will be supported to make the application.

Guidance is being strengthened to ensure consistency of practice and to help those carrying out assessments to determine how an individual's eligible needs can best be met. In addition, we will provide further clarity to service users and carers on what they can expect from Adult Social Care.

4.2 Care Management

A review and analysis of expenditure in Adult Social Care identified that 87% of the net budget is spent on the provision of care to individuals, either in their own homes or in a residential or nursing setting.

Consideration will be given to the cost effectiveness of placements and packages of care. Where the cost of a package of care in the community is greater than the cost of a residential or nursing homes placement, the service user will normally

be expected to have their care needs met by admission to residential/nursing care. If an individual prefers to remain at home, social care staff will discuss how their needs may be otherwise met (e.g. by community meals, alternative sources of support).

Adult Social Care Support Planners will work in partnership with the service user to develop a support plan based on the most cost effective way to meet care and support needs. This may include considering their family and support networks, their welfare benefits and the community resources available to determine how needs are best met.

As a result, people who currently receive a specific service may in future have their eligible needs met in a different and more cost effective way. Consultation will be undertaken where it is proposed to change a service that affects a group of service users.

To ensure resources are spent in an equitable way that gives value for money to the public, we will normally:

- not pay more for a community package of care than we would pay for a residential or nursing package of care
- undertake a continuing healthcare check if we think someone might be eligible for free NHS care
- include all ongoing care services in someone's financial assessment
- not admit someone to residential care from a hospital bed
- not allow a care service put in place to resolve a crisis to continue as a normal service without careful review
- consider a range of housing options in seeking the most appropriate and affordable for each individual

Wherever possible, we will put short-term services in place that will aid recovery or recuperation and a return to independence, before considering long-term care or support. We will encourage creativity and innovation to meet identified outcomes, and encourage everyone involved to look for solutions that offer the best quality and value for money.

A prevention and early intervention programme will be undertaken jointly with partners in health services as part of the Better Care Fund programme. This will review all community support services that provide early intervention, prevention and targeted support to help people live independently. The proposal is to integrate these services to streamline care pathways and provide them in a more cost effective way.

4.3 Commissioning

Our approach to commissioning social care services will be focussed on achieving outcomes and delivering value for money. Commissioned services will ensure that needs are met flexibly and in a way which maximises independence.

The approach to commissioning will also respond to the development of personal budgets and use of direct payments by shaping the provider market to ensure that providers offer their service users choice and flexibility. Providers will be encouraged to offer creative, innovative services, focussed on meeting needs

with the least amount of formal care and support, while delivering identified outcomes.

There are 2 savings proposals relating to the Public Health budget. The first outlines savings that will largely be met by a deploying resources differently and by using unallocated spend. A further £2m has been identified which would be require some variation in contracts with health providers. A notice of intention to vary would need to be submitted by 30/9/14 but this will still allow for the Council and stakeholders to give full consideration to the detailed proposals and their impact.

4.4 Formal Consultation

Consultation with users and carers will follow good practice guidance on changes in charging policies and increases or changes in charges. The guidance states that where changes in charging policies would result in significant increases in charge for some users, this should be specifically explained and considered as part of the consultation.

Where these proposal impact on a particular group of users or carers it will be essential to undertake formal consultation with service users. Detailed consultation documents will be drawn up as appropriate and will be considered by the Healthier Select Committee prior to any consultation being agreed.



Customer Services Directorate

Consultation on charging for disabled persons Blue Badge

September 2014

Part 1 – About this Consultation

Topic of this consultation

1. This consultation is about the proposal to charge a £10 fee for a disabled persons Blue Badge which allows parking in reserved areas and at no charge. The £10 fee would be payable by successful new applicants and on review every 3 years.
2. Currently no fee is charged but the Council is charged £4.60 for each badge it issues.
3. The proposal would generate an income of £24,000 pa.

Audience

4. Anyone may respond to this consultation and all responses will be fully considered.
5. We are particularly keen to hear from current Blue Badge holders and anyone or any agencies that support them to understand the impact the proposal may have.

Duration

6. The consultation will be open for 3 weeks from 4 November 2014. The deadline for responses is 25 November 2014.

How to Respond

7. A letter will go to support agencies and 100 Blue Badge holders. There are several ways to respond to this consultation:
 - On the Council web site
 - By post to London Borough of Lewisham, PO Box 58996, London SE6 9JD

After the Consultation

8. Once the consultation has closed all responses will be considered and a summary of responses collated and included in a report to Mayor and Cabinet.

Part 2 – Background

9. In 2011 the Disabled Person's Blue Badge scheme was reformed. Prior to the reforms the Council was allowed to charge an administration fee of £2 per badge issued. However, the Council chose not to due to the cost of collection.
10. The reforms introduced a more complex badge that is produced centrally on behalf of all local authorities and costs the Council £4.60. The

Council is allowed charge an administration fee of up to £10 for each Blue Badge. To date the Council has not charged for a Blue Badge.

11. Blue Badges are not a means tested entitlement i.e. you do not have to be on a low income to qualify.
12. Blue Badges are reviewed and where appropriate issued every 3 years.
13. There are currently 7,200 Blue Badges in use.

Lewisham Council Financial Position

14. Since 2010 the Council has cut more than £100 million from its budget. The Council needs to find savings of £85m in the next 3 years. For this reason the council has been undertaking a fundamental review of all its budgets.

Part 3 – The proposal

15. To charge a £10 fee for a disabled persons Blue Badge which allows parking in reserved areas and at no charge. The £10 fee would be payable by successful new applicants and on review every 3 years. There would be no charge for an unsuccessful application.

Timetable

16. The proposed timetable for the proposal which is subject to agreement by Mayor and Cabinet and the consultation process is:

23 October 2014 – report to Mayor and Cabinet
4 November 2014 – consultation process
December 2014 – Mayor and Cabinet
January 2014 - implementation

Part 4 – Consultation Questions

17. We are happy to receive responses to this consultation in any format and we are particularly keen to hear your views on the following:
 - a. The Council is allowed to charge up to £10 for a disabled persons Blue Badge. The charge would be payable following a successful application and on renewal every 3 years. What will the impact be if the Council charges £10 for a disabled persons Blue Badge?



Customer Services Directorate

Consultation on proposed removal of discretionary Freedom Pass scheme

September 2014

Part 1 – About this Consultation

Topic of this consultation

18. This consultation is about the proposal to stop issuing new discretionary Freedom Passes and withdraw the 1,175 passes currently in use. Discretionary Freedom Passes, which allow free travel on public transport in London, are issued on application in the following circumstances:

Criteria for mobility condition:

- Unable to walk over 300 metres unaided
- Applicant has a degenerative medical condition effecting mobility

Criteria for Mental Health conditions:

- The mental health criteria identified is that the applicant has an enduring mental health condition and has accessed secondary care mental health services in the last 12 months.

19. The proposal would generate a saving of approximately £200,000 pa.
20. It is estimated that 68% of those affected would qualify for subsidised travel under another travel scheme that is not funded by the Council.

Audience

21. Anyone may respond to this consultation and all responses will be fully considered.
22. We are particularly keen to hear from current discretionary Freedom Pass holders and agencies that deliver services to them to understand the impact the proposal may have.

Duration

23. The consultation will be open for 3 weeks from 4 November 2014. The deadline for responses is 25 November 2014.

How to Respond

24. A letter will be sent to support agencies and 100 discretionary Freedom Pass recipients. There are several ways to respond to this consultation:
- On the Council web site
 - By post to London Borough of Lewisham, PO Box 58996, London SE6 9JD

After the Consultation

25. Once the consultation has closed all responses will be considered and a summary of responses collated and included in a report to Mayor and Cabinet.

Part 2 – Background

26. The Transport Act 2000 sets out the criteria which are used to determine eligibility to the National Freedom Pass scheme. The criteria are:
- Blind or partially sighted,
 - Profoundly or severely deaf,
 - Without speech,
 - Disabled or has suffered an injury, which has a substantial and long – term adverse affect on his/her ability to walk,
 - Without arms or has long – term loss of the use of both arms,
 - Has a learning disability, that is, a state of arrested or incomplete development of mind which includes significant impairment of intelligence and social functioning,
 - If applied for the grant of a licence to drive a motor vehicle under Part III of the Road Traffic Act 1988, have his/her application refused pursuant to section 92 of the Act (physical fitness) otherwise than on the ground of persistent misuse of drugs or alcohol.
27. There are 37,000 Freedom Pass holders in the borough and the proposal does not impact on any of them.
28. The Transport Act 2000 allows the Council to have a locally determined discretionary Freedom Pass scheme for persons with a disability that do not meet the above criteria. In 2008 the Council implemented a discretionary Freedom Passes scheme, which allows free travel on public transport in London. Discretionary Freedom Passes are issued on application in the following circumstances:
- Criteria for mobility condition:**
- Unable to walk over 300 metres unaided
 - Applicant has a degenerative medical condition effecting mobility
- Criteria for Mental Health conditions:**
- The mental health criteria identified is that the applicant has an enduring mental health condition and has accessed secondary care mental health services in the last 12 months.
29. There are currently 1,175 discretionary Freedom Passes issued.

Lewisham Council Financial Position

30. Since 2010 the Council has cut more than £100 million from its budget. The Council needs to find savings of £85m in the next 3 years. For this reason the council has been undertaking a fundamental review of all its budgets.

Part 3 – The proposal

31. The proposal is to stop issuing new discretionary Freedom Passes and to withdraw those currently in use to deliver a saving of approximately £200,000 pa.
32. A recent sampling exercise of those currently in receipt of a discretionary Freedom Pass suggested that 68% would qualify for an alternative concession, this being 63% who would qualify for the JC+ travel discount card and 5% for the 60+ London Oyster card.
- JC+ travel discount card – This is available to residents who have been unemployed for 3 months and over, received a qualifying benefit or must be working with an advisor for a return to work, they will be able to apply for a concession that gives them half-price travel;
 - 60+ London Oyster card – This is available to residents who live in a London borough, are over the age of 60 but who do not qualify for a FP and they will qualify for free travel.

Timetable

33. The proposed timetable for the proposal which is subject to agreement by Mayor and Cabinet and the consultation process is:

23 October 2014 – report to Mayor and Cabinet
4 November 2014 – consultation process
December 2014 – Mayor and Cabinet
January 2014 - implementation

Part 4 – Consultation Questions

34. We are happy to receive responses to this consultation in any format and we are particularly keen to hear your views on the following:
- b. What will the impact be if the Council stops offering a discretionary Freedom Pass?

APPENDIX 5 – Early Intervention and Safeguarding (Q1) proposal

| CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SELECT COMMITTEE | | |
|--|---|--|
| Report Title | Early Intervention and Safeguarding Savings Proposals | |
| Key Decision | Yes | Item No. |
| Ward | All | |
| Contributors | Director of Children’s Social Care, Executive Director Children & Young People Executive Director Resources & Regeneration Head of Law | |
| Class | Part 1 | Date: 2 ND October 2014 |

1. Purpose

- 1.1 As part of the 2014-16 budget strategy, savings are being proposed relating to Early Intervention and Safeguarding services

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 This report sets out the savings proposal to make savings of £3.834m during 2015/18 through reorganisation within Children’s Social Care and the Early Intervention Service, which now sits within Children’s Social Care division of the Children and Young People’s Division. Of the sum of £3.834m, £2.611m is proposed for delivery in 2015/16. Consultation would be required for the proposals.

3. Recommendations

The Mayor is recommended to agree the proposals to:

- 3.1 save £510k by reforming triage at the Children’s Social Care “front door” to reduce the number of assessments undertaken.
- 3.2 reshape early intervention services run through the Children’s Centres in order to reduce costs by £1.936k
- 3.3 support the costs of the re-organised service with £1,388k of Troubled Families grant;
- 3.4 agree to carry out consultation with parents, professionals and other agencies including those in the voluntary sector on the re-designation of Children’s Centres and delivery of services to be more flexible and focused.

4. Policy Context

- 4.1 The Council's Sustainable Strategy "Shaping our Future" sets out a vision for Lewisham and the priority outcomes that we can work towards in order to make this vision a reality. In considering how to achieve the budget savings we have worked to the nine principles agreed in the 14th July 2010 report to Mayor and Cabinet. The Children and Young People's Plan 2012-2015 sets out our priorities for development. The work undertaken by officers and the proposals set out in this report are in line with the aims and objectives of these policy frameworks.

5. Background

- 5.1 Lewisham Council has already reduced its revenue budget by £82m since 2010. However the continued pressure on public spending means that the Council needs to make further savings of around £85m between 2015 and 2018.
- 5.2 In 2012, the Council commissioned its Children's Centre services with a budget of £3.2m.
- 5.3 A Targeted Family Support service was also commissioned in 2012 at a cost of £1.1m.
- 5.4 The Children's Centre and Targeted Family Support contracts come to an end in March 2015, although with the option for extension, which gives scope for exploring future options. At the present time we operate 17 Children's Centres across the borough. They are all commissioned services. Currently we have 8 Children's Centres being run by The Children Society, 2 by the Pre-School Learning Alliance (PSLA) and 7 are school-run Children's Centres. A map showing the Children's Centres and their geographical location is attached at Appendix A. We require, through our contracts with the Children's Centres, to achieve three key outcomes. Children's Centres are monitored against the outcomes. The three outcomes that we expect from the Children's Centres are:
- to improve parenting and attachment
 - to improve school readiness
 - to prevent escalation, including to more specialist services, such as Children's Social Care or child mental health services (CAMHS)
- 5.5 These outcomes have helped to focus providers on impact and they are linked to a payment by results framework for which 30% of funding depends (a) on the number of targeted families reached and (b) the outcomes achieved with these families. We currently have no plans to change the outcomes measures that we will expect from our providers when re-tendering. All but one Children's Centre provider met or came close to their reach targets last year. Four out of seven performed well in relation to their outcomes targets.

5.6 The Council also commissions Targeted Family Support (TFS) that works alongside our Children's Centres and other providers to provide intense support to children and their families. Whilst Children's Centres concentrate more on the under 5s (although not exclusively), TFS works with all children up to the age of 18. Their work is much more focused on working with children and their families in their homes, providing intensive support to achieve the outcomes outlined above. The service is contracted to work with 400 new targeted families per annum. Last year, (2013-14), they reached 87.5% of this target (350 families). This year, so far, they are ahead of their target of 100, with 112 families.

6. Proposals

6.1 There are a number of strands to the proposal that we are putting forward to meet the budget savings. In order to reduce the number of assessments that are carried out by Children's Social Care, the aim is to introduce a multi-agency triage system at the referral point to ensure that contacts to the department can be directed to the appropriate service and cut down on the need for social workers to carry out assessments that lead to referrals on to the other services or no further action.

6.2 Other proposals centre around how we can re-procure the Children's Centres contracts more flexibly to reduce costs as well as reducing the number of families that we will fund Children's Centres to reach and fund the Children's Centres at a unit cost based on the unit costs of the best performing Children's Centres. The new criteria for the Troubled Families grant will mean that we can use this money to pay for some of the Children's Centres provision as the outcomes are the same.

6.3 Introducing Integrated Triage into Children's Social Care

6.3.1 This will require reform of the Front Door in Children's Social Care. Details are still being developed, including the necessary cultural change that will be required across the children's partnership. At the current time we have a number of routes that professionals can use to refer a child that they have concerns about. They can refer directly to the Early Intervention Service who will help with accessing appropriate support or they can refer to services directly (Children's Centres, TFS etc). However, the largest numbers of contacts are received by Children's Social Care.

6.3.2 In the year 2013/14, Children's Social Care received over 21,037 contacts of which just fewer than 10% reached the threshold for Children's Social Care. It is estimated that each of these contacts cost about £20.00 in staff time to process and record that no action is taken. A contact is recorded whenever a child or young person is brought to the attention of Children's Social Care even if the threshold is not met for a social work assessment. There is a requirement that the contact is still logged and the reason why it does not meet threshold is recorded.

An assessment involves a social worker visiting the family and seeing the children and talking to the professional network around the child to obtain a holistic view of the child and family and decide on any action or support that is required. Of the assessments carried out by Children's Social Care social workers, 75% led to the case being closed by Children's Social Care. In many cases, the interventions during the assessment process brought about the necessary changes, or if concerns remained this may have been passed on to another agency, including early intervention services, to support the family.

- 6.3.3 The savings in this area will accrue from an expected reduction in the number of assessments that are undertaken for which there is no further action. This will allow the deletion of a social work team and the early intervention team supporting the partnership in the use of the common assessment form. In the future, cases will be more effectively "triaged" and passed directly to the right services, thereby reducing the number of assessments by about 15%. It is estimated that each social work assessment costs around £600 to complete. It is proposed to implement the changes so that they are effective by October 2015. The expected saving of £510k is spread over 2015/16 and 2016/17 with £255k expected in each year.
- 6.3.4 The above plan is not without risk. Professionals and members of the community, such as concerned relatives and neighbours are regularly re-assured that an assessment has been carried out by a qualified social worker with the particular expertise that they can bring to a family. The new model that we are proposing will mean that 15% of these cases will not get these assessments. The building of capacity in the partnership and access to consultation with social workers is therefore an important part of this process. Please see 6.3.8 below for more details about building capacity.
- 6.3.5 The process of setting up a multi-agency triage system at the front door has already started on a smaller scale with the introduction of the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) in December 2012.
- 6.3.6 The MASH has engaged all the key agencies involved in safeguarding work to be jointly located in order to share information quickly so that an appropriate response can be made to safeguarding referrals. At the present time, the Police, Children's Social Care, Health and Early Intervention services are co-located in Laurence House. There is also instant access to Probation and the Youth Offending Service who are also part of the MASH but are not co-located. In future we will be aiming to ensure that when a contact with a family is received that we pass this referral to the appropriate agency to contact the family, and provide support to families as necessary. The aim will be to ensure we prioritise the social care staff time to support the most vulnerable families in Lewisham.
- 6.3.7 A number of other local authorities have tried this approach. The London Borough of Hackney took a similar approach a number of years ago. Staff from Lewisham have visited Hackney to learn lessons and

to inform our approach. We have also visited Newham who are adopting a similar approach to ourselves and have discussed with Southwark who are also redesigning their front door services along similar lines. Newham and Southwark are in their infancy in their plans so it is too early to see any impact. Hackney have noted a decrease in the referrals going to the Children's Social Care teams.

6.3.8 At the same time as introducing the triage system at the front door, we will be aiming to link the four remaining teams in Referral and Assessment to the current Children Centre areas. The aim will be for Children's Social Care social workers to be more closely attached to the areas to develop the capacity of partners, especially our Children Centres to work with challenging families to prevent escalation to Children's Social Care. The aim is that social workers will offer support to early intervention workers working with families. This could be by offering consultation, joint visits to model how to work with families or training on specific issues. The expectation is that by being linked that they will be able to develop better relationships with all agencies in their areas, for example, schools and health providers.

6.4 Changing Children Centre contracts as they are re-procured – removing the requirement for reception and administration

6.4.1 The Children's Centre contracts are due for renewal as at 31st March 2015. The LA currently retains responsibility for the administration and management of all 17 premises partly to ensure the hours of opening are consistent with a universal service as part of Ofsted expectations/ definitions. This costs £500k. By implementing a new model of delivery of Children's Centres (please see section 6.7) cost will be saved through the more flexible use of the buildings. The expectation in tendering would be that the successful contractor(s) would not be required to have specific reception or administration offices and they could provide this in a more flexible way as they consider necessary. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015, a saving of £250k would arise in 2015/16 and £250K in 2016/17.

6.5 Changing Children Centre contracts as they are re-procured – reduce the unit cost of working with each family

6.5.1 The providers under the current contracts have showed varied success in terms of meeting targets and demonstrating value for money. The overall average unit cost we currently pay is £579 per family. The average unit cost of the top 4 performing Children's Centres is £462, and it is proposed to reduce the unit cost across all sites to this amount, thus achieving a £644k saving. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015 a saving of £322k would arise in 2015/16 and £322k in 2016/17.

6.6 Changing Children Centre contracts as they are re-procured – reduce the number of families to be worked with by a third party

6.6.1 Given the savings required, it will not be possible to sustain work with the number of families currently receiving a service. The proposal is therefore to reduce the expected volumes of targeted families receiving a service. Using the above reduced unit cost of £462, a saving of £792k would mean that 3800 families could be reached. This is 1700 fewer targeted families than the 5500 who are currently targeted to receive a service. Although this is a reduction in number, it can be mitigated by maintaining and developing alignment of health visiting delivery to children's centre provision. As the date of implementation is to be October 2015 a saving of £396k would arise in 2015/16 and a further £396k in 2016/17.

6.7 In order to deliver a viable service under the reshaped contracts, re-configure Children's Centres to be more flexible and focused.

6.7.1 For the above proposals to be taken forward, it would be necessary to change the existing model of delivery, in order that the Children Centres remain viable. Under the current Children Centre regime, all centres are required by Ofsted to:

- be open, and staffed, 9am-5pm, 5 days a week
- open 48 weeks a year
- be subject to inspection
- comply with an extensive set of data and monitoring requirements
- provide a range of services as specified by statute

6.7.2 The proposal is to re-designate our Children's Centres so that some or all are freed from these requirements so that they can operate more flexibly and at lower cost. Collectively across the Estate, all services currently being offered would still be available but they could be configured differently.

6.7.3 Proposals are still being designed and the savings would need to be subject to consultation with parents, professionals and others, including the voluntary sector. The new model will require closer working with health visitors, in particular and this more flexible approach will enable us not to close any Children's Centres.

6.8 Use of the Troubled Families Grant to fund more early intervention work

6.8.1 The Family Intervention Project (FIP) is used extensively with challenging families by CSC and in delivering work aligned with the Government's Troubled Families programme. The FIP is specifically designed to work with families where the children are on the edge of care. This is regularly teenagers who parents are finding it difficult to manage. Many will be involved in the Youth Justice system. The current cost of the service is £488k pa, £200k of which is already

funded through Troubled Families. There is scope to fund the whole cost of the service – a further £288k - using Troubled Families grant.

- 6.8.2 Similarly, the Targeted Family Support Service works with vulnerable families as part of early intervention. The new criteria for phase 2 of the Troubled Families programme is likely to align more with our approach and there is scope therefore to fund more of our early intervention work through the Troubled Families grant - an additional £1.1m.
- 6.8.3 The Contract for the renewal of the contract to provide Targeted Family Support (TFS) is also due for renewal in April 2015. There are no plans to reduce the spend on TFS, and in fact we may increase the size of the contract to include support for young people as outlined in the Youth Service Report.
- 6.8.4 Further work needs to be completed in order to establish the model for Children's Centre provision into the future and we are seeking the Mayor's approval to commence this work and consultation.
- 6.8.5 In carrying out the detailed work we will be looking to learn lessons from other authorities. However the picture of how other local authorities provide their Children Centre provision across the country is very mixed. A number of authorities still provide their Children Centres directly and the quality of these is mixed. However, given the budgets available to Lewisham this would not be feasible. Other authorities, like Lewisham, have commissioned their Children Centres. The picture of how successful this has been has again been mixed. Some authorities, for example, Barking and Dagenham, have opted to bring their services back "in house", due to their provider not providing suitable provision. Other commissioned services have a varying picture with ratings from Ofsted showing the full range of outcomes from outstanding to inadequate. This reflects the position in Lewisham with one of our main providers struggling to reach the goals set in the contract whilst others are doing an excellent job. In Lewisham the school based Children's Centres have consistently performed the best and this has been seen in other parts of the country as well.

7. Basis for the proposal

- 7.1 **Savings** – The savings generated by the proposals affecting Children's Centres will amount to a total of £1,936,000 over two years 2015-17.
- 7.2 **Value for Money** – As the current contracts for Children's Centre service providers are coming to an end, this enables the re-specification of the Children's Centre contracts to ensure greater value for money with a reduced cost per family, based on the unit costs of the highest performing Centres.
- 7.3 **Community involvement and empowerment** – Public consultation will need to be carried out as part of determining any proposed changes to Children's Centres. Local community groups and parents/carers could also be supported to deliver services from the

Children's Centre sites to replace and/or complement more targeted services.

- 7.4 **Promoting area-wide benefits** – Children's Centres will continue to be focal points for the community. Increased links with Children's Social Care will strengthen the Children's Centre offer, particularly to the most vulnerable families. Working in partnership with local communities and service delivery by voluntary sector organisations, whether as a commissioned provider or key delivery partner, will complement the Council objective of strengthening the third sector. It will also facilitate the provision of local services including additional resources for local schools and organisations supporting families within the area.

8. Key Issues

- 8.1 **Designation** – Lewisham's Sure Start Children's Centres were designated by the Department for Education (DfE) between 2004 and 2010. There is a legislative framework for designated Children's Centres and they are also subject to Children's Centre inspections by Ofsted (see Section 13 below).
- 8.2 **Fewer targeted families** – The current commissioned Children's Centres are contracted to work with 5,500 targeted families per year. The proposal is for this to be reduced to 3,800 per year. Although this is a reduction, greater partnership working between Children's Social Care, health services and Children's Centres could ensure a more robust service to families most in need with increased links with key partners such as the health visiting service, midwifery, GPs and schools ensuring that the universal offer is maintained with a targeted approach where needed.
- 8.3 **Reduced Unit cost** – a reduced unit cost per targeted family each Children's Centre works with will reduce the funding available to Centres but, with increased support from Children's Social Care and other agencies, including the voluntary sector and health, some of the services currently in operation could be delivered by different organisations and partners instead of Children's Centre staff or services they commission.
- 8.4 **Admin Staff** – Eight administrative staff are currently employed by the Local Authority to perform the administrative and reception function in the Children's Centres commissioned to the Area Providers, The Children's Society and Pre-School Learning Alliance. With these Centres being re-designated and utilised differently, they would no longer need to be open 9-5, Monday to Friday, 48 weeks of the year and would no longer need this function.

9 Next Steps

- 9.1 Subject to the agreement of the Mayor, officers will work to further explore the implications of the proposals and carry out consultation to inform development of the proposals.

10 Financial Implications

- 10.1 The total budget for the services affected by the proposals described in the report is £5,499k.
- 10.2 The proposal has three discrete elements that together provide a saving of £2.6m in 2015/16 and £1.2m in 2016/17 making a total of £3.8m over the period 2015/18. The savings can be summarised as follows:

| | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|---|--------------|--------------|---------|--------------|
| Integrated Triage | 255 | 255 | | 510 |
| Changes to Children Centre contracts and re-designation of Children Centres | 968 | 968 | | 1,936 |
| Use of Troubled Families Grant | 1,388 | | | 1,388 |
| Total Savings | 2,611 | 1,223 | - | 3,834 |

- 10.3 The Integrated Triage proposals require work across the children's partnership to implement so the saving is spread over two years. Reducing the number of contacts and assessments undertaken will require fewer staff resulting in the deletion of a social work team. There are a number of posts that are currently covered by agency staff. As a result, no redundancy costs would be expected to accrue from this element of the proposal.
- 10.4 The 'Integrated Triage proposal will also see the deletion of the Team Around the Child Team of four posts. It is likely that the deletion of posts will result in redundancy costs.
- 10.5 The removal of administrative and reception responsibilities will involve the deletion on 8 posts. It's likely that redundancy costs will accrue.
- 10.6 The Children Centre services are currently delivered through contracted arrangements and so the reduced unit costs and targeted families will not result in reduced staff numbers for the Council. However, there may be a redundancy liability for the Council depending upon the final decision and its implementation on the contracts for children centre services due to the administration staff being employed by the Council currently.
- 10.7 Recent announcements indicate that there will be sufficient funding to support the switch of funding for the FIP and TPS contracts from General Fund to Troubled Family grant resources. The switch is an extension of current practice as the work is intended to be undertaken through use of the Troubled Families grant.

10.8 Capital Financial Implications

10.8.1 A number of the designated Children Centres benefited from capital investment funded by central government. There is a provision for capital clawback if a centre ceases to provide certain activities. The basis of clawback would be the initial capital investment the period over which benefits have flowed and the expected life remaining of the investment. The proposal for the contracted services is that they would enable the range of services expected to continue to take place. On this basis capital clawback is unlikely to apply. No assessment of any clawback is possible until there are proposals from a successful contractor for reduced activity on a relevant site.

11. **Key Risks**

11.1 Key risks have been outlined above, especially in terms of capital claw back from the Department of Education.

11.2 An additional risk is in deleting a team of social workers. For this to work we need to build the capacity of the partnership to work with families. The risk is that if our early intervention providers are unable to meet the needs of these families, the issues with the children may escalate and have to be referred back to social workers. This could put pressure on our social work capacity. However, the proposals include measures to support early intervention providers and other services, including HVs, and we are optimistic that will enable us to make the saving secure.

11.3 Reducing capacity in the Children's Centres will increase demand/expectation in the health visiting services (the budget for which will transfer to LAs in 2015).

11.4 Fewer assessments by social workers could bring an increased risk of safeguarding failure – we will ensure training and support is available so that staff can identify the correct cases for referrals so the system is safe rather than risk averse.

12. **Legal implications**

12.1 Legislative framework – Section 17 of the Children Act 1989, the council is under a duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of children who are in need, and promote the upbringing of children by their families by providing a range of services appropriate to those children's needs.

12.2 The Childcare Act 2006 places a duty on local authorities to improve the well-being of young children (from birth to age five) in their area, reduce inequalities between them and ensure that "early childhood services" are provided in an integrated manner. The Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009 inserted new provisions into the Childcare Act 2006 so that the Act now defines Children's Centres in law, placing duties on local authorities in relation to establishing and

running Children's Centres. In addition, Health services and Jobcentre Plus need to consider regularly whether the early childhood services they provide should be delivered through Children's Centres.

- 12.3 The Childcare Act 2006 as amended, states, requires "arrangements to be made by local authorities so that there are sufficient children's centres, so far as reasonably practicable, to meet local need." (Section 5A)
- 12.4 The DfE Sure Start Children's Centres Statutory Guidance, April 2013 (the Guidance) states that local Authorities should "ensure that a network of children's centres is accessible to all families with young children in their area;" and "ensure that children's centres and their services are within reasonable reach of all families with young children".
- 12.5 Lewisham currently has 17 designated Children's Centres across the borough. Were some Centres to be re-designated, it would need to be demonstrated that "sufficient" Children's Centres remained which were accessible and within reasonable reach of families with young children across the borough.
- 12.6 Governance of Children's Centres – Section 5C of the Childcare Act 2006 places a duty on local authorities to ensure each Children's Centre has an Advisory Board with the purpose of ensuring the effective operation of the Children's Centre within its remit. The Act does not require that each Centre has its own board and allows the clustering of Centres to share an Advisory Board. The Local Authority must ensure that membership of these boards includes LA representatives as well as representatives from the Children's Centre/s within its remit, parents and prospective parents and key partners such as health services and local community groups.
- 12.7 Currently, all 17 Children's Centres have individual Advisory Board structures with school-based Centre representatives being invited to part of the Area Providers' Advisory Boards. If there were fewer designated Centres, the Area model of Advisory Boards could be developed. Fewer Advisory Boards would ease the pressure on partner agencies such as midwifery, health visiting and GPs to ensure representation and, in addition should widen representation from agencies such as Jobcentre plus, currently under represented on Advisory Boards. Partners from the voluntary sector would also be better able to send representatives to each Advisory Board meeting with fewer in operation.
- 12.8 Range of services – Designated Children's Centres are required to provide a range of services and activities either directly or through partners including outreach and family support, early education, a range of health services and employment and training support for parents and carers. These include universal as well as targeted services. Not all Children's Centre services have to be delivered in a Children's Centre but with reduced resources the re-designation of

some Centres would give greater flexibility to the range of services that can be delivered within the community rather than from a single site.

- 12.9 Children's Centre Ofsted Inspections – Under Part 3A of the Childcare Act 2006, as amended, Designated Children's Centres are subject to inspections from Ofsted. Rigorous data sets are required for inspections as are a wide range of other evidence of need and impact. Whilst much of this is helpful in considering areas of need and of tracking outcomes and impact, the level of data required for inspections and the time spent by providers in ensuring readiness for Ofsted inspections at any time would be significantly reduced with a smaller number of designated Centres.
- 12.10 Consultation – The DfE Sure Start Children's Centres Statutory Guidance April 2013 states that Local Authorities “must ensure there is a consultation before...making a significant change to the range and nature of services provided through a Children's Centre and/or how they are delivered”. A public consultation would therefore need to be held if significant changes to the Children's Centres are considered.
- 12.11 Capital claw-back - The re-designation of a Children's Centre may prompt the DfE to consider whether to “claw back” funding previously awarded for capital development of the Centre. The risk of this might be reduced if it could be ensured that services for children and families continued to be delivered from the site. This could be achieved through supporting local community groups and parents/carers to deliver services as well as key partners from the statutory and voluntary sectors.
- 12.12 A Children's Centre is defined in the Childcare Act 2006 (the Act) as a place or a group of places which is managed by or on behalf of or under arrangements with a local authority with a view to securing that early childhood services in the local authority's area are made available in an integrated way. They can be made available either by providing the services on site, or by providing advice and assistance on gaining access to services elsewhere.
- 12.13 It follows that children's centres are as much about making appropriate and integrated services available as about providing premises at particular geographical sites.
- 12.14 Notwithstanding this, as stated in paragraph 12.4 above, the Guidance states that there should be a network of children's centres which are accessible to families and young people in the local authority's area.
- 12.15 The local authority must ensure that there is a sufficiency of children's centres, as far as reasonably practicable, to meet local need which is defined in the Act as the need of parents, prospective parents and young children in the local authority's area.
- 12.16 Any changes to children's centres is subject to consultation as set out in this Report and such consultation must take into account the views

of local families and communities in deciding what is sufficient children's centre provision. The consultation should also include the views of Health services and Job Centre Plus.

- 12.17 In relation to the proposal to delete the social work team and the early intervention team as part of the reform of Children's Social Care the Council's redundancy and redeployment procedure will apply and the Council's Management of Change Guidelines.
- 12.18 The proposals to re-configure the children's centres as part of their re-procurement as set out at paragraph 6.4 to 6.7 of this report will involve reorganisation of staff at the centres, and or redundancy and this may lead to a cost to the Council if the organisations cannot absorb this.
- 13. The Equality Act 2010 (the Act)** introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 13.1 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.
- 13.2 The duty continues to be a "have regard duty", and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.
- 13.3 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled "Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice". The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>

14. Equalities Implications

14.1 An Equalities Impact Analysis has been undertaken and is attached as Appendix B.

15. Crime and Disorder Implications

15.1 There are no crime and disorder implications arising directly from this report.

16. Environmental Implications

16.1 There are no specific environmental implications arising directly from this report.

Background documents

None.

If there are any queries arising from this report, please contact Ian Smith, Director of Children's Social Care, telephone 020 8314 8140.

NB

- A map showing the Children Centres in Lewisham is provided as a separate attachment
- The equalities assessment for this proposal is appended below.



Equalities Analysis Assessment

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of proposal | Children's Centres Savings Proposals |
| Lead officer | Ian Smith |
| Other stakeholders | |
| Start date of Equality Analysis | August 2014 |
| End date of Equality Analysis | September 2014 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Title of Project | Budget Savings Proposal: Children's Centres |
| Lead officer | Ian Smith |
| Other stakeholders | Children and young people; Parents and families; Children's Centre providers; MPs; local councillors. |
| Start date of Equality Analysis | August 2014 |
| End date of Equality Analysis | September 2014 |

1: Background to undertaking an Equality Analysis

- 1.1 This Equality Analysis Assessment (EAA) is being undertaken to identify whether budget proposals to re-shape the Children's Centres and their services will adversely affect Lewisham's children, young people and their families and whether it will negatively impact upon protected characteristics¹.
- 1.2 Lewisham Council has already reduced its revenue budget by £93m since May 2010. The Government's continued squeeze on public spending means that the Council needs to make further savings of around £85m over the next three years. The proposal to re-shape the Children's Centres and their services is one of the savings proposals being put forward in September 2014
- 1.4 This EAA will be a scoping exercise to try to identify the service users that may be affected by the proposal, and to identify and understand any potential negative impacts from taking the savings proposal forward, together with developing mitigating actions to minimise any negative impacts identified. This EAA will contribute towards the decision making process.
- 1.5 This EAA will:
- (1) consider whether the proposal is compliant with the new public sector duty;
 - (2) consider the impact of the proposal;
 - (3) analyse whether the proposal is likely to have a positive or negative impact on different protected characteristics within the local community; and
 - (4) identify mitigating actions to address any disproportionately negative impact.

¹ Protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership (only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination)

2: Changes to the service

2.1 Statutory duty - what needs to be provided:

Local authorities are required to make arrangements to secure that early childhood services in their area are provided in an integrated way that facilitates access to services and maximises the benefits to children, parents and prospective parents. The arrangements made under section 3(2) of the Childcare Act 2006, as amended by the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009, must include arrangements for sufficient provision of children's centres to meet local need.

2.2 Current service provision:

Children's Centres in Lewisham are commissioned out to school-based providers and two voluntary organisations. They offer both a universal and targeted service, predominantly to families with children under 5, but also work with families with children aged 0-19 particularly where older children are the siblings of younger children in the family.

It is estimated that 8671 adults (61,684 contacts) and 6982 children age 0-4 (57,533 contacts) used the service between April 2013 and March 2014. This is based on usage data available to the Council through commissioned providers and entered on to the Tribal Connect database.

2.3 The proposal and changes to the service:

The proposal is to re-designate some Children's Centres and re-shape some existing services from 2015 onwards. Services and opportunities for parents to access support will continue to be provided by the Council through the Children's Centres which remain as well as maternity services and health visitors with which greater links are being developed alongside the increased links with Children's Social Care.

Development of re-designated Children's Centres will be explored and could include better use of the voluntary sector and community-led provision to ensure continued delivery of services to children and families, particularly targeted support to families who need it most.

The proposal will mean the deletion of 8 administration posts.

3: Assessment of data and research

3.1 General Context & Local Demographics:

Lewisham is the second largest inner London borough and in 2011 was home to approximately 274,900 people (GLA population estimates) which is set to grow by around 11,000 by 2015. Lewisham has a slightly younger age profile than the rest of the UK; children and young people aged 0-19 years make up 24.5% of residents, compared to 22.4% for inner London and 23.8% nationally. Births in Lewisham increased by 34% between 2000/01 and 2009/10 and will continue to increase at a similar rate for the next 5 years.

Lewisham's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment shows that from data in 2010, Lewisham is the 15th most ethnically diverse local authority in England, and two out of every five residents are from a black and minority ethnic background. The largest BME groups are Black African and Black Caribbean: Black ethnic groups are estimated to comprise 30% of the total population of Lewisham. This rises to 77% of our school population, where over 170 different languages are spoken by our pupils.

Deprivation is increasing in Lewisham. The 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation ranked Lewisham 31st out of 354 local authorities (LAs) in England compared to a rank of 39 in 2007. On the specific indicator of income deprivation affecting children, 35 (out of 166) of Lewisham's super output areas are in the 10% most deprived in the country, and 85, (over half) are in the 20% most deprived in the country. It is estimated that 20,355 children (ages 0 – 18) live in poverty in Lewisham.

3.2 Childrens Centres and Ward profiles:

There are 17 designated Children's Centres in Lewisham. Each Centre broadly delivers services to a particular ward

The Children's Society : Area 1

Evelyn Children's Centre* - Evelyn Ward
Besson Street Children's Centre* - New Cross Ward
Hatcham Oak Children's Centre* - Telegraph Hill Ward
Amersham Children's Centre* - Brockley Ward

The Children's Society : Area 2

Ladywell Children's Centre* - Ladywell Ward
Manor House Children's Centre* - Lee Green Ward
St Swithun's Children's Centre* - Lewisham Central Ward
Heathside and Lethbridge Children's Centre* - Blackheath Ward
TCS Area 2 also covers Rushey Green Ward

Pre-School Learning Alliance : Areas 3 and 4

Torridon Children's Centre* - Catford South and Whitefoot Wards
Bellingham Children's Centre* - Bellingham Ward

School Based Children's Centres

Clyde children's Centre (Area 1) – Evelyn Ward
Beecroft Garden Children's Centre (Area 2) – Crofton Park Ward

Downderry Children's Centre (Area 3) – Downham Ward
 Marvel's Lane Children's Centre (Area 3) – Grove Park Ward
 Eliot Bank and Kelvin Grove Children's Centre (Area 4) – Sydenham and Forest Hill Wards
 Kilmorie Children's Centre (Area 4) – Perry Vale Ward

There are Administration Posts in all of the Area Contract Children's Centres*. School based centres manage their own administration within the contract.

Children's centres provide services and support to children under 5 and their older siblings. This is focused on adopting a 'whole-family' through pulling together appropriate teams of practitioners around families to ensure all children and young people's needs are met through multi-agency support. CC Services are currently delivered by the voluntary sector and schools across the borough at 18 designated Children's Centres (Appendix A).

Children's centres are expected to secure improvements against the following overarching outcomes for children, young people and families in Lewisham:

- Improved parenting and attachment.
- Improved school readiness.
- Prevention of escalation.

Age

Children's Centres primarily provide a universal service for all children aged 0-5 years accompanied by an adult carer. The closure of any services will therefore have the greatest impact on provision to this group.

Disability

Data collected from users in 2013-14 shows the following percentage of contacts were with those identifying as having a disability:

| Ward | % of 0-4 Children using Children's Centres that have a disability | % of adults using Children's Centres that have a disability |
|---------------|---|---|
| Bellingham | 1.5% | 1.3% |
| Blackheath | 0.9% | 0.0% |
| Brockley | 2.2% | 0.5% |
| Catford South | 2.7% | 0.8% |
| Crofton Park | 1.2% | 0.8% |
| Downham | 0.3% | 0.8% |
| Evelyn | 4.2% | 1.8% |
| Forest Hill | 0.6% | 1.3% |
| Grove Park | 0.4% | 0.6% |
| Ladywell | 4.3% | 0.3% |

| | | |
|------------------|------|------|
| Lee Green | 1.7% | 0.3% |
| Lewisham Central | 2.6% | 2.1% |
| New Cross | 2.1% | 0.6% |
| Perry Vale | 1.3% | 0.0% |
| Rushey Green | 1.9% | 0.8% |
| Sydenham | 1.9% | 1.5% |
| Telegraph Hill | 1.5% | 0.6% |
| Whitefoot | 0.9% | 0.5% |

Pregnancy and Maternity

Children's Centres are heavily used by pregnant women and new mothers as the Centres offer a range of services for young families e.g. Breast Feeding Support, parenting courses and support, support for immunisations, health checks and development etc. The closure of any services will therefore have a significant impact on provision to this group.

Race

The Census data from 2011 indicates that the locations where Children's Centres are based have some of the highest proportion of black and minority ethnic (BME) residents in the borough.

The ethnicity profile of Children (0-4) using Children's Centres is as follows:

| Ward | Population (2011 Census) | % of 0-4 Children using Children's Centres that are BME | % of adults using Children's Centres that are BME |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Bellingham | 59.8% | 74.5% | 69.7% |
| Blackheath | 44.0% | 53.0% | 60.3% |
| Brockley | 58.4% | 64.8% | 67.7% |
| Catford South | 66.5% | 63.9% | 61.0% |
| Crofton Park | 53.0% | 49.4% | 51.5% |
| Downham | 49.3% | 66.4% | 65.6% |
| Evelyn | 74.1% | 77.0% | 81.0% |
| Forest Hill | 95.3% | 60.0% | 59.4% |
| Grove Park | 47.6% | 69.6% | 62.4% |
| Ladywell | 59.8% | 56.5% | 56.3% |
| Lee Green | 45.9% | 55.1% | 60.3% |
| Lewisham Central | 65.4% | 75.2% | 69.7% |
| New Cross | 73.4% | 83.1% | 79.8% |
| Perry Vale | 54.2% | 58.2% | 57.6% |
| Rushey Green | 70.2% | 75.3% | 74.5% |
| Sydenham | 53.4% | 67.3% | 62.7% |
| Telegraph Hill | 62.8% | 63.4% | 63.3% |

| | | | |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
| Whitefoot | 58.3% | 73.2% | 70.7% |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|

The data suggests that Children's Centres are more heavily used by BME groups than the ward profiles would suggest and therefore any reduction in service would have a greater effect on BME families.

Sex

The majority of adult carers who attend the Children's Centres are female, and so the impact of the proposal will be felt most by this group.

There is no anticipated impact relating to religion and belief, gender reassignment, or sexual orientation.

3.3 Staff data:

In-House Administration Staff

| Workforce Profile Information | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------|
| Age: | 21-25: 1 | 36-40: 1 | 46-50: 2 | 51-55: 2 | 55+: 2 |
| Disability: | Disabled: 1 | | Not Disabled: 7 | | |
| Gender reassignment: | None | | | | |
| Pregnancy and maternity: | None | | | | |
| Race: | BME: 5 | White: 3 | Other: 0 | Not Known: 0 | |
| Religion or belief: | Christian: 3 | None: 1 | | Unknown: 4 | |
| Sex: | Female: 7 | | Male: 1 | | |
| Sexual Orientation | Straight / Heterosexual: 4 | | Not known: 4 | | |
| Marriage and civil partnership: | Not Married / Civil Partnered: 1 | Married / Civil Partnered: 3 | | Not known: 4 | |

N.B. Of these staff, two are temporary appointments (up until 31/03/2015)

Children's Centre Staff

As Children's Centres are contracted out and the proposals are not specific at this stage, this information is not yet known.

4: Consultation

A public consultation exercise would be required for any material change to the service that the Borough provides via its network of Children's Centres in accordance with the Equalities Act 2010.

There are also specific requirements around consultation set out in the [Statutory Guidance](#) for Children's Centres under the Heading "Significant changes to children's centre provision and the duty to consult" (see page 10).

5: Impact Assessment

The Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken to ensure that in the case of implementation of the saving proposal to fundamentally change the delivery of services currently provided by Children's Centres, the Council has met its responsibilities under the Equality Act 2010, specifically:

- To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation.
- To advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups.
- To foster good relations between people from different groups.

The assessment of the potential impact on the nine protected characteristics (age, disability, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion and belief, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity and marriage/civil partnership) has been based on an analysis of service information, including available data relating to service users, and will be considered further in the light of equalities data collected during consultation.

5.1 Impact on Service Users:

As the proposal is to reduce the amount of designated Children's Centres, it is anticipated that proposals will yield a negative impact for the service user. However, many of the negative impacts that may arise from the closure of the service can be mitigated through other services and actions. In addition, the Early Intervention Service, will encourage and support the private, voluntary and independent sector to run their own activities in order to supplement the core service.

Age:

The proposed will have the greatest impact upon children aged between 0 and 5 years. There is a range of provision similar to stay and play available across the borough from providers other than the Council. In addition there are existing parks and playgrounds, carer and Toddler groups, Childminder Drop-Ins, Stay and Play sessions, Dad's Stay and Play, Play and Learn for under 5s, and many others. Existing services that will continue to be offered include signposting to other services, the universal 3 and 4 year old entitlement to the 15 hours free early education, as well as the universal health visiting service.

Disability:

Several of the categories for identification of targeted families concern families where disability is an issue (Children of parents with mental health issues, Children of parents who have

disabilities, Children with disabilities). Therefore any reduction in the service provided will have a greater impact on these families.

Sex:

Women are the main user group of the service, and the proposal is therefore likely to impact most on this group. It is also noted that the service is also used by fathers, who may find it harder to access alternative services.

Ethnicity:

Many of the residents of the borough do not speak English as a first language Children's Centres are a useful service for these parents and carers. The Council will need to ensure that interpreting and translation services are available in order to communicate with these families/CYP to ensure that they get the support that they need.

The EAA has not identified any disproportionate effects relating to Sexual Orientation, Religion and Belief, Pregnancy and Maternity, or Gender reassignment.

5.2 Impact on Staff:

The proposal would most likely see the service provision in Children's Centres reduced. There is a proposal to deleted 10 administration posts (2 of which are vacant). Further reduction of the service will inevitably result in further reduction in posts from other providers and their may be TUPE considerations for some staff who were transferred when the service was outsourced in 2011.

There may be re-deployment opportunities available, but it is recognised that the economic climate has had an impact on the number of positions available.

The majority of administration staff directly employed in the service by the London Borough of Lewisham are female (7 of 8), and the majority of staff delivering the service across the borough through commissioned providers are also female. There will therefore be a disproportionate effect on women if the proposal is taken.

6: Decision/ Result

Following an analysis of the available research and data it is recommended to continue with the proposal but with actions to mitigate negative impact on equality and diversity. An action plan should be written following consultation once a firmer understanding of the likely effects of following the proposal are known.

Sign Off

Signed _____ Date _____

APPENDIX 6 – Youth Services (Q2) proposal report

| Children and Young People Select Committee | | | |
|---|--|----------|------------------|
| Report Title | Savings proposals and the future of the Youth Service | | |
| Key Decision | Yes | Item No. | |
| Ward | All | | |
| Contributors | Executive Director (Children and Young People), Executive Director (Resources and Regeneration), Head of Law | | |
| Class | Part | Date | 2nd October 2014 |

1. Summary

As part of the Council's budget strategy for 2015 - 2018, the Youth Service presents proposals for savings of at least £1.4m. The report also sets out two options for consideration on the future of the Youth Service to allow planning to proceed into future years.

Option 1 looks at the potential employee mutualisation of the Youth Service following initial reductions.

Option 2 considers reducing the Service to a statutory service only model and increasing the savings by a further £1.7m.

2. Purpose

2.1. The purpose of this report is to outline for the Mayor the savings reduction options being put forward in response to Council-wide savings requirements.

3. Recommendations

The Mayor is recommended to:

- 3.1. agree the base savings of £1.4m, including:
 - 3.1.1. a reduction to youth worker capacity and removal of Council staff from two youth sites
 - 3.1.2. a reduction to commissioned provision
 - 3.1.3. a reduction to management and business support staff
 - 3.1.4. further efficiency savings
- 3.2. agree the reshaping of youth re-engagement services (see section 6.13):
 - 3.2.1. re-specify the specialist 1:1 service and fund it from other sources
 - 3.2.2. re-specify the NEET Programme in accordance with Raising the Participation Age (RPA) and alternatively fund the programme.

- 3.3. decide the future of the Youth Service from Options 1 and 2 below:
- 3.3.1. **Option 1:** With the reduced budget in place agree that officers pursue an employee-led mutual (ELM) with a start date of April 2016.
OR
- 3.3.2. **Option 2:** Reduce the Service to a statutory duty only model.
- 3.4. agree that consultation proceeds regarding the removal of Council-run youth club provision from two centres and on the future options for the service. (see sections 6.3 to 6.5).
- 3.5. agree the timetable for implementation of the savings (see section 11).

4. Policy context

Local Policy

- 4.1. The proposals within this report are consistent with the Council's corporate priorities and its need to identify significant savings over the next three fiscal years. In particular, the proposals relate to the Council's priorities regarding Young People's Achievement and Involvement, Protection of Children, and Community Leadership and Empowerment, in line with the Children & Young People's Plan of 2012 – 2015.

National Policy

- 4.2. Positive for Youth was launched in December 2011 as a broad-ranging strategy detailing the Government's approach to youth provision. The strategy calls for 'a new partnership approach' in local areas – between businesses, charities, public services, the general public and young people – to provide more opportunities and better support to young people.
- 4.3. The priorities of last year's restructure were aligned with this strategy.
- 4.4. Positive for Youth promotes early and positive support to reduce the chances of public funds being wasted in holding young people in expensive secure provision or managing the remedial effects of inadequate support and assistance as they reach young adulthood.
- 4.5. The key strategic themes contained in Positive for Youth and Lewisham's Children and Young People's Plan are as follows:
- Helping young people to succeed
 - Promoting youth voice
 - Early intervention
 - Supporting stronger local partnerships
 - Strengthening communities and the voluntary sector

5. Background

- 5.1 Since May 2010, the Council has reduced its budget by c.£93m. In response to reductions in Government grants, the Council is planning to make further savings of £85m by the close of 2017/2018.
- 5.2 During 2013/2014, the Youth Service implemented a significant organisational restructure. The restructure released savings of £1.03m. These savings were achieved primarily by reducing staff headcount by 18.1 FTE, including a 72% reduction in management, removing youth work staff from two youth centres – Grove Park Youth Centre and Oakridge Youth Centre – and generally ensuring more efficient operations across the service.
- 5.3 The restructure created a leaner, more efficient service more capable of responding to young people's needs. It also introduced a significantly larger commissioning pot from which voluntary sector and other providers could bid to run youth services.
- 5.4 In this first year post-restructure, the Service has been embedding performance management, income generation and contract management capabilities.
- 5.5 The Youth Service maintains the following aims:
- 1) Encourage others, as well as the Council, to deliver a vibrant range of activities for all our young people to enjoy and benefit from, and to recognise that all activities for young people across Lewisham and London are an important part of our youth offer.
 - 2) To support young people in Lewisham in need of extra help, to achieve the skills they need to become happy, healthy and successful adults.

These aims work to engender the following outcomes for young people:

- 1) Improved life skills
 - 2) Increased involvement in education, employment or training
 - 3) Staying safe and well, and preventing needs from escalating
- 5.6 The Youth Service provides and facilitates access to a range of activities for young people through a combination of direct delivery, support to access delivery provided by other organisations, and commissioning and partnering with the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector. The activities are now focused on developing young people's life skills as agreed in the previous reorganisation of the service.
- 5.7 Provision includes positive activities for young people, offering them places to go and things to do, including social and cultural activities, sports and play, and early intervention services. The Youth Service also offers informal education,

advice and guidance on career choices and healthier lifestyles, and information concerning the dangers of substance misuse.

- 5.8 The Service's specialist support for young people in relation to education, employment and training consists of 9 specialist one-to-one youth workers, each holding a maximum caseload of 15 cases at any one time, with an annual service reach of c.270 young people. Alongside a one-stop 'holistic support' shop, Baseline, in Lewisham town centre and a variety of commissioned providers, the Service provides one-to-one youth work and information, advice and guidance for the Borough's most vulnerable including support to young fathers, young women and those considering their sexuality. Additionally, the NEET Programme has been offering four 6 week work support programmes for young people who are not in education, employment or training. As a part of the 2013/14 restructure the scheme is changing to become a 12 week Government-recognised traineeship, in partnership with Bromley College, from September 2014. The programme will run 3 times a year in line with school terms. It will continue to work with the same cohort of vulnerable young people, however the longer traineeship will allow them to achieve more robust qualifications, offer accredited numeracy and literacy support and stronger pathways post completion. The scheme will also allow participants to continue to receive out of work benefits whilst on the scheme.
- 5.9 All of these activities and support systems take place at 7 Council-run youth centres, 5 Council-run adventure playgrounds, via street based work, at Baseline and at a variety of non-council run venues across the Borough.

6 Savings proposal of £1.4m

- 6.1 With the following savings proposals, the general scope of the Service would remain intact. Under this proposal, staffing levels would be reduced to the minimum level believed necessary to operate an ELM in the future.
- 6.2 In order to release savings across the Service, it is proposed the Service retain 5 youth centres and 5 APGs, while removing staff from 2 youth centres and ending the Service's street based capacity, reducing front-line staff headcount commensurately. The recommendations as to which two centres would be offered to the voluntary sector or closed are based on factors such as location, the potential for the PVI sector to deliver provision from the sites, and the attractiveness of the remaining facilities to generate income.
- 6.3 Appendix 2 shows a map of the current youth centres and adventure playground sites.
- 6.4 It is therefore proposed to close or find alternative providers for youth provision at Ladywell Youth Village and Rockbourne Youth Centre. Both centres already have alternative non-Youth Service provision running from them. Rockbourne

offers short break provision two weekday evenings and Saturdays, and Ladywell offers short break provision on Saturdays. Rockbourne is due to host a scout group from October, whilst Ladywell operates as an adult day care centre the majority of the time. These proposals could allow these provisions to continue and the sites to remain open, enabling the savings to result only from the reduction of Youth Service youth work staff and their delivery of mainstream youth provision.

- 6.5 In both cases, it is proposed the sites remain open in order for short breaks to continue and potentially increase and/or voluntary sector provision to continue and potentially increase.
- 6.6 The Youth Service would continue to directly run the following youth sites:
- 1) Bellingham Gateway Youth & Community Centre, Bellingham
 - 2) Honor Oak Youth Club, Brockley
 - 3) Riverside Youth Centre, Deptford
 - 4) The New Generation Youth Centre (TNG), Sydenham
 - 5) Woodpecker Youth Centre, New Cross
 - 6) Deptford Adventure Playground, Deptford
 - 7) Dumps Adventure Playground, Bellingham
 - 8) Home Park Adventure Playground, Sydenham
 - 9) Ladywell Adventure Playground, Ladywell
 - 10) Honor Oak Adventure Playground, Brockley
- 6.7 The Youth Service's street-based outreach capacity is comprised of 3.4 FTE Support Youth Workers. It is proposed the Youth Service remove this capacity in its entirety. Street-based outreach is not currently a stand-alone team of youth workers dedicated solely to outreach work; it is staffing capacity only. Because of current support staff vacancies the Service is only operating a limited street-based outreach capacity at the moment. Current outreach is used to inform young people of what the Service offers and spur their participation at our youth sites. Our Participation and Engagement Officer's role involves outreach work and it is hoped that some of the loss of street-based capacity could be mitigated by the communications work of the Participation and Engagement Officer. Outreach work could continue with the proposed reduction in staffing, but this would impact the Service's ability to deliver centre-based activities.
- 6.8 Ending Council-run provision at 2 youth centres and removing the street-based outreach capacity would result in a staff headcount reduction of 7.5 FTE Youth Workers (3 FTE Senior and 4.5 FTE Support workers - from 17.5 FTE to 10 FTE). The Youth Service programming provision budget would be reduced commensurate with the end of activity at 2 centres. This reduction would yield a saving of £273,000.

- 6.9 It is proposed that the Specialist Support Manager post be removed from the staffing structure, enabling management of the NEET Programme to be absorbed by remaining managerial staff.
- 6.10 The current Service structure contains 60.7 FTE. The proposed structure will contain 50.2 FTE – a projected staffing reduction of 10.5 FTE and a total saving of £418,000.
- 6.11 In order to release further budget savings, but still maintain the Service’s relationship with the community and voluntary sector, it is proposed that commissioning funds be reduced in line with the savings required by the Council – a reduction of 31% (£293,000). During the last restructure, commissioning funds were doubled. A reduction of 31% will still enable the Service to commission an amount greater than what was available in 2012/13. Commissioning funds are used to procure from the private and voluntary sector a broad range of provision that supplements the Youth Service’s direct delivery and ensures diversity of youth provision across the borough, as well as offers elements of specialist activities that the Service could not offer alone. A process for downsizing current commissioning arrangements would commence from October/November.
- 6.12 The Service currently allocates monies for training, a level of public resource IT, print materials, stationery and other miscellaneous expenses. It is proposed the Service identifies efficiencies in this area of its budget, enabling a saving of £24,000.
- 6.13 The Service will generate income by renting space to private and community sector users and bidding for relevant, available grants. It is proposed the Service aims to generate a minimum of £100k of income to mitigate some of the reductions. Based on current projections and the retention of at least 5 youth centres and 5 adventure playgrounds, it is feasible the Service will reach this target of £100k by the end of 2015/2016.

Reshaping youth re-engagement services

- 6.14 There are three elements of the current service that are proposed to be brought together more strategically to form a youth re-engagement service that operates under the aegis of the Youth Service in the short term, but would remain with the Council if the Youth Service mutualises or is reduced to a statutory service. In the case of the former, the Council could commission an ELM to provide services, if doing so yields better value and is in the best interest of young people. This would leave a resource of £705k focused on re-engaging young people for 2015/16. The elements of this service are:
- a) Specialist 1:1 Service
 - b) The NEET Programme

- c) NEET tracking services
- a) **The Specialist 1:1 Service** is an outreach service operated out of Baseline in Lewisham Town Centre. It is currently comprised of 9 FTE Specialist Youth Workers, 1 FTE Specialist 1:1 Coordinator and 1 FTE Specialist Support Manager, representing a total cost of £450k. The service works with young people and offers individual support to empower them to become resilient and support themselves through issues and to help them achieve positive life outcomes. The service also supports emergency situations, signposting to others and delivers holistic information, advice and guidance. The proposal is to remove the Specialist Support Manager post, as noted above in section 6.8, leaving a budget of £390k and then consider the best means to continue delivery. This could be via re-specification and potential commissioning of the service as part of the Targeted Family Support Service. Regardless of form, it is proposed that savings are made as set out and the reduced service be funded through use of the Government's Troubled Families Grant and income from other sources which are being currently investigated, including the Education Funding Agency and schools.
- b) **The NEET Programme** currently operates out of the The New Generation (TNG), runs four times a year and comprises 1 FTE Specialist Group Work Coordinator, 1 FTE Senior Youth Worker, 1.2 FTE Support Youth Workers and programme costs. The total current cost of the service is £197k. As a part of the 2013/14 restructure the scheme has already undergone changes set to begin in September 2014. These make the scheme a formal traineeship. Whilst the programme will continue to work with the same demographic of young people, it will reduce to 3 programmes per year, but increase the length of each to 12 weeks, offer literacy and numeracy qualifications and be funded in-part by Bromley College. It is proposed that, further to these changes, initial savings of £82k be made by removing the Specialist Group Work Coordinator post and further reducing the programming costs. This will leave a budget of £115k. The then reduced service would be funded via alternative monies from schools, colleges and the Education Funding Agency.
- c) The Council has a statutory responsibility to monitor and track NEETs and to support vulnerable NEETs. It is proposed that this element of the Youth Service remains intact, with 1 FTE NEET Tracking Manager, 1 FTE NEET Tracking Coordinator, 1 FTE NEET Tracker, the information management system and a communications budget. Minor reductions are proposed to be made to the communications budget. This will leave a budget of £200k.

The £705k total cost of a re-engagement service is:

- a) £390k for specialist 1:1 support services
- b) £115k for NEET Programme
- c) £200k for tracking young people who are NEET

7. Options for the future of the Youth Service

7.1 It is important strategically to set an end option for the Youth Service due to further Council funding reductions required in subsequent years. Annual reductions to the Service would have a detrimental effect on young people and frontline staff who serve them, making it difficult to involve young people in the face of diminishing provision and motivate and retain talented staff in the face of continuing requirements for redundancies. The following two options are proposed in order to forestall these and other negative implications.

7.2 Option 1: mutualise the Youth Service

7.2.1 Option 1 proposes moving to an ELM after the initial savings are made. This would require a lead-in time of one year to research, develop and prepare for an ELM, and then at least three more years to support an ELM on a contractual basis.

7.2.2 Mutualisation, or the development of an employee-led mutual (ELM), refers to a council or state entity that spins-away from its parent statutory body, enjoys enhanced autonomy concerning governance and provision, and continues to deliver vital public services whilst reinvesting financial surpluses back into the organisation.

7.2.3 The initial savings proposals already described would leave intact a service model that is believed could become a viable business.

7.2.4 The benefits of mutualising the Youth Service are as follows:

- There would be a greater opportunity for involvement of young people in the Borough by allowing them to become part owners of the ELM and have an elected place on its board.
- The ELM would have greater flexibility to strategise, innovate and better meet the needs of end users and stakeholders.
- As an ELM, the entity could avail itself of grant funding streams, sponsorships and income generation opportunities currently unavailable to local authorities.
- A good level of youth provision would be maintained in the Borough long-term with reduced or potentially no funding from the Council.
- Moving to an ELM has the potential to influence positively organisational behaviour, particularly with regard to creating a shared sentiment of staff ownership, minimising sick days and increasing influence over future decisions.
- The Council would retain a relationship with a staff group that maintains already-established relationships with young people and community members in the Borough.
- Opting out of the Council would reduce longer-term liabilities to the Council.

- 7.2.5 If Option 1 is agreed, the Youth Service would immediately enter into the planning and scoping stages of creating an ELM. This would include financial and consultative support from the Cabinet Office Mutuals Support Programme. The Council would need to be clear in the funding agreement setting up the ELM what its core requirements are while it continues to provide funds. It will be important, however, to secure for the ELM as much freedom as possible during and after the planning stages.
- 7.2.6 The Youth Service would need to retain significantly more autonomy than at present during the lead-up period and subsequent 3-5 years of operation. This would be to ensure an ELM can raise funds, adjust the balance between commissioned and direct provision, allow staff to build an organisation underpinned by a social business ethos, and form strategic alliances that would maximise the ability for an ELM to succeed.
- 7.2.7 A Youth Service ELM would continue to deliver universal and targeted youth provision whilst reinvesting any financial surpluses back into the organisation. The entity would be initially funded via a Council contract and generate income through grant funds, corporate and individual philanthropy, space rentals, charges to schools and subcontracting arrangements.
- 7.2.8 There are currently two youth service ELMs in operation in England – Epic CIC (formerly Kensington & Chelsea’s Youth Service) and Knowsley Youth Mutual (formerly Knowsley’s Youth Service). Should the Youth Service mutualise, there will be lessons to learn from those that have gone through the process and now operate as independent entities. There would also be learning from other areas of the Council that have followed similar strategies, including Wide Horizons, Education Business Partnerships, Libraries and housing.
- 7.2.9 However, the two ELMs in operation are still fairly new and it is unclear yet whether they will be able to become completely self-supporting organisations with no funding from “their” Council. While it would be the intention that our ELM would become self-supporting after 3 years, and that the Council could then realise full savings, there is a risk that it would not achieve that aim. In that case, a decision would need to be made as to whether the Council continues to support the ELM financially or not.
- 7.3 Option 2: Reduce the Youth Service to a statutory service only model, releasing further savings of £1.7m
- 7.3.1 Option 2 proposes reducing the Youth Service to a statutory service only model now, leaving intact capacity to uphold our minimum statutory requirements to facilitate access to non Council-run youth provision, track NEET young people and report results to Government using a Client Caseload Information System.

7.3.2 The cost of this service would be £300,000 (facilitation £100k and NEET tracking £200k), releasing a further £1.7m on top of the £1.4m proposed earlier in the report. Where the current structure is comprised of 60.7 FTE the proposed structure would be comprised of 4 FTE – a reduction of 56.7 FTE. The remaining service would be managed by the NEET Tracking Manager or by a post within the broader CYP structure. The four FTE posts remaining would be:

- 1) Participation & Engagement Officer
- 2) NEET Tracking Manager
- 3) NEET Tracker
- 4) NEET Coordinator

7.3.3 Given this, all youth centres and APGs would be supported to be passed into the hands of others in the community to run, or they would be closed; all youth workers, managers and all but one commissioning and business support staff would be made redundant and all commissioned and direct provision would end.

8. Implications of initial £1.4m savings

8.1 On staff and service provision

8.1.1 The Service and its current capacity would be reduced and a level of redundancy would be unavoidable. Clear lines of management would remain and the breadth of individual responsibilities would increase in line with the terms of job descriptions.

8.1.2 The current structure has 60.7 FTE posts. There are currently 58.14 FTE staff in post, which is comprised of 89 people. The vacancies currently are 2.56 FTE posts. The proposed structure will have 50.2 FTE. This is a proposed reduction of 10.5 FTE. This reduction is comprised of 1 FTE SO1, 4.5 FTE Sc5, 1 FTE PO6, 1 FTE PO3, 3 FTE PO1 . All reductions would first be made by not filling vacancies. Due to the number of part-time contracts within the current Service, it is not currently possible to calculate the exact number or make-up of employees who may be redundant.

8.1.3 Reducing youth worker and site capacity could cause demand to exceed supply, forcing certain sites to absorb the impact that stems from site closures. To mitigate this, the service proposes that it retain 1 fte Support Youth Worker beyond the minimum in order to provide enhanced staffing when necessary.

8.1.4 Reducing the commissioning fund may impact on some voluntary sector providers.

| | Current | Proposed | Difference |
|---|---------|----------|------------|
| Full-time equivalents (FTEs) in post | 60.7 | 50.2 | 10.5 |

9. Implications of Option 1

9.1 On staff

- 9.1.1 Following the initial savings of £1.4m, any remaining staff at the point of transfer would be transferred in accordance with TUPE to the ELM. Part of the ELM development work may indicate the need for re-shaping or re-sizing prior to transfer. The details of this would be part of the ELM planning and development work as to how liabilities may be covered. This would need to include how liabilities for the Local Government Pension Scheme could be met. It is unlikely that the ELM would be able to meet these liabilities at the outset. In the two ELMs currently operating, their local authorities have kept the liabilities for transferred staff.
- 9.1.2 Employees of the ELM would hold non-dividend shares and share ownership of the entity.
- 9.1.3 Employees would be involved directly in the strategic direction and governance of the ELM. The governance structure would enable elected staff members a voting role on the board of directors.
- 9.1.4 Employees would be responsible to take part in business skills training to enhance their existing skill-sets and contribute commercial acumen to the ELM.
- 9.1.5 Youth workers would continue their roles as youth workers and maintain their existing relationships with young people.

10. Implications of Option 2

10.1 On staff

- 10.1.1 The Service would no longer be retained and a high level of redundancy would be unavoidable. Only those posts with responsibility for ensuring a statutory duty would be retained.
- 10.1.2 The current Service structure is comprised of 60.7 FTE posts (including 2.56 FTE vacancies). There are currently 89 people in post. The proposed structure would contain 4 FTE – a post reduction of 56.7 FTE. The maximum redundancy cost to the Council is estimated at £496k.

11. Timetable for savings

| Activity | Date |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Scrutiny Paper (publically available) | 23 rd Sept '14 |
| Scrutiny process occurs | Oct '14 |
| Mayor and Cabinet decision | Nov '14 |

| Activity | Date |
|---|-----------------------|
| Consultation of Options 1 and/or 2 | Nov '14 – Jan '15 |
| Mayor and Cabinet decision | Feb '14 |
| Full Council decision | Feb '14 |
| Implementation of savings | April '15 – July '15 |
| If Option 1, ELM planning process | April '15 – April '16 |
| If Option 1, ELM spin-out and contracting | May '16 – May '19 |

12. Financial implications

12.1 Initial savings of £1.4m and Option 1

12.1.1 The current controllable revenue budget for the Youth Service is £3,461,000. The proposals would result in immediate savings of £801,000, use of Troubled Families Grant, alternative funding of £505,000 and income generation of £100,000. Taken together these will result in a savings to the controllable budget of £1,406,000.

12.1.2 The proposal is based on an estimated minimum saving of £1,406,000 to the Youth service controllable budget. The delivery of this in the first year will depend on the timing of implementation including notice periods of staff made redundant.

12.1.3A significant portion of the savings £505k or 36% is dependent upon alternative income sources such as the Education Funding Agency, Schools and other contributions. These sources are not yet determined and represent a risk in terms of achievability of the savings.

12.1.4 There will be redundancy costs for the Council emerging from these proposals, although at this stage it is too early to calculate the exact amount, which depends on those staff identified for redundancy. The maximum estimated redundancy cost for the service is £154,000. However, the actual redundancy cost is likely to be lower than this.

12.1.5 Any buildings no longer used by the Youth Service will need to be considered either for use by alternative community providers or placed onto the asset transfer register. Since the majority of building maintenance costs sit outside the Youth Service controllable budget, costs for sites, if open, will still need to be factored into wider council budgeting. Any revenue savings on premise running costs will accrue to the corporate asset management savings account.

12.1.6 Given the reductions to staff and buildings, there will be implications for the Youth Service non-controllable budget. It is expected that savings will be made, though at this stage it is too early to early to determine what the exact amount will be.

12.1.7 Should the Youth Service mutualise, the total costs of service delivery would need to be established. These include ICT, building maintenance, Human Resources, legal services and costs for all back office services (i.e. items not in the control of the Youth Service currently). The sum of these costs would need to accrue to an ELM's revenue budget and be controlled by the entity. The level of this further saving would be dependent on the success of the ELM and Council's strategic and financial decisions at the time. It is expected that an ELM could procure support services cheaper than current corporate contracts, specifically in terms of IT. This would be as a result of different specification for organisation-wide services and that, as a stand-alone entity, an ELM may be perceived differently and more favourably than the Council.

12.1.8 There would need to be consideration of how the ELM's pensions and redundancy liabilities might be met as set out in paragraph 9.1.1

12.1.9 After the implementation of the budget savings, the Youth Service controllable budget will be reduced by at least 41%. This decrease is proportionately greater than the proposed decrease to the total Council budget.

12.2 Option 2

12.2.1 The current controllable revenue budget for the Youth Service is £3,461,000.

12.2.2 The proposal is based on an estimated minimum saving of £3,161,000 to the Youth service controllable budget. The delivery of this in the first year will depend on the timing of implementation. After the implementation of the budget savings, the Youth Service controllable budget will be reduced by at least 91%. This decrease is proportionately greater than the proposed decrease to the total Council budget.

12.2.3 There will be redundancy costs for the Council emerging from these proposals, which depends on those staff identified for redundancy. The maximum estimated redundancy cost for the service is £496,000.

12.2.4 Any buildings no longer used by the Youth Service will need to be considered either for use by alternative community providers or placed onto the asset transfer register. Since the majority of building maintenance costs sit outside the Youth Service controllable budget, costs for sites, if open, will still need to be factored into wider council budgeting. Any revenue savings on premise running costs will accrue to the corporate asset management savings account.

12.2.5 Given the reductions to staff and buildings, there will be implications for the Youth Service non-controllable budget. It is expected that savings will be made, though at this stage it is too early to early to determine what the exact amount will be.

13. Legal Implications

- 13.1 Section 507B Education Act 1996 imposes a duty on local authorities, so far as is reasonably practicable to promote the well-being of persons aged 13-19 (and of persons aged up to 25 with learning difficulties) by securing access for them to sufficient educational and recreational leisure-time activities and facilities. A local authority can fulfil this duty by providing activities and facilities, assisting others to do so, or by making other arrangements to facilitate access, which can include the provision of transport, financial assistance or information.
- 13.2 Before taking any action under section 507B of the Education Act 1996 a local authority is required to take steps to assess whether it is beneficial for other agencies and individuals to provide services in its place and where appropriate, to secure that those services are provided by such agencies or individuals. There is also a statutory requirement to consult with such persons as the local authority consider appropriate as to whether it is expedient for the proposed actions to be taken by another person.
- 13.3 In carrying out its statutory responsibilities under section 507B of the Education Act 1996 a local authority is required to ascertain from young people in the authority's area their views on the existing provision and the need for any additional provision, and to take those views into account.
- 13.4 Local authorities are required to supply and keep up to date information regarding those leisure-time activities and facilities that are available locally.
- 13.5 Section 68 of the Education and Skills Act 2008 places a duty on local authorities to make available to young people and relevant young adults for whom they are responsible such services as they consider appropriate to encourage, enable or assist them to engage and remain in education or training.
- 13.6 The proposals set out in this report have to be consistent with the local authorities ability to meet its statutory responsibilities.
- 13.7 In relation to any staff reorganisations and/or redundancies the Council will have to comply with general employment legal obligations and the Council's Management of Change Guidelines.
- 13.8 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 13.9 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.

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

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

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

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

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

14. Crime and Disorder Implications

14.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications.

15. Equalities Implications

15.1 The Equalities Analysis Assessment can be found at Appendix 1.

16. Environmental Implications

16.1 There are no specific environmental implications.

Background documents

None.

If there are any queries arising from this report, please contact Warwick Tomsett, Head of Targeted Services and Joint Commissioning, telephone 020 8314 8362.

NB

- A map showing the Youth Service provision in Lewisham is provided as a separate attachment
- The equalities assessment for this proposal is appended below.

Appendix: Equalities Analysis Assessment for Youth Services Proposals

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Equality Analysis Assessment (EAA) has been undertaken to identify whether budget proposals for the Youth Service will have an adverse impact on Lewisham's young people and other affected groups with protected characteristics². The proposals seek to reshape the Youth Service in response to savings requirements.
- 1.2. The EAA will contribute towards considering a service which is as responsive to young people's needs as possible given budgetary constraints, and which ensures equality of access to provision. Actions are proposed to minimise any negative impact on affected stakeholders as a result of the proposals.

2. Background

- 2.1. The Council has already reduced its revenue budget by £93m since May 2010. However, the estimate is that the Council will need to save another £95m by the close of 2017/18. Savings will be required across the Children and Young People's Directorate and the Council as a whole. In order to achieve this, the Youth Service must contribute towards the savings whilst maintaining a youth offer which is focused on those in need.
- 2.2. The proposals are expected to enable continued compliance with the following statutory duties for local authorities in relation to the provision of youth services:

Department of Education statutory duty and guidance, June 2012

- *With the right supportive relationships, strong ambitions and good opportunities all young people can realise their potential and be positive and active members of society. Most get these from and through their families and friends, their school or college and their wider community enabling them to do well and to prepare for adult life. All young people benefit from additional opportunities and support, but some young people and their families, particularly the most disadvantaged and vulnerable, need specific additional and early help to address their challenges and realise their potential.*
- *It is therefore local authorities' duty to secure, so far as is reasonably practicable, equality of access for all young people to the positive, preventative and early help they need to improve their well-being. This includes youth work and other services and activities that:*

² Protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership (only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination)

- a. *Connect young people with their communities, enabling them to belong and contribute to society, including through volunteering, and supporting them to have a voice in decisions which affect their lives;*
- b. *offer young people opportunities in safe environments to take part in a wide range of sports, arts, music and other activities, through which they can develop a strong sense of belonging, socialise safely with their peers, enjoy social mixing, experience spending time with older people, and develop relationships with adults they trust;*
- c. *support the personal and social development of young people through which they build the capabilities they need for learning, work, and the transition to adulthood – communication, confidence and agency, creativity, managing feelings, planning and problem solving, relationships and leadership, and resilience and determination;*
- d. *improve young people’s physical and mental health and emotional well-being;*
- e. *help those young people at risk of dropping out of learning or not achieving their full potential to engage and attain in education or training; and*
- f. *raise young people’s aspirations, build their resilience, and inform their decisions – and thereby reduce teenage pregnancy, risky behaviours such as substance misuse, and involvement in crime and anti-social behaviour.*

2.3. The Council retains statutory duties relating to tracking and monitoring young people’s participation in education. These duties are fulfilled by the Youth Service.

Department of Education statutory duty and guidance, March 2013

- Local authorities must collect information to identify young people who are not participating, or who are at risk of not doing so, to target their resources on those who need them most. The information collected must be in the format specified in the Client Caseload Information System (CCIS) Management Information Requirement
- Local authorities should be aware that all young people aged 16 (from 2013) and 17 (from 2015) will be under a duty to participate and authorities should be doing all they can to support them to meet that. The Client Caseload Information System will function as the main source of evidence that local authorities are discharging their duty under section 12 of the Employment and Support Allowance Regulations 2008.

3. General context: Local demographics

- 3.1. Lewisham is the second largest inner London borough and, in 2011, was home to approximately 274,900 people (GLA population estimates), which is set to grow by around 11,000 by 2015. Lewisham has a slightly younger age profile than the rest of the UK; children and young people aged 0-19 years make up 24.5% of residents, compared to 22.4% for inner London and 23.8% nationally.
- 3.2. Births in Lewisham increased by 34% between 2000/01 and 2009/10 and are expected to continue to increase at a similar rate for the next 5 years. Lewisham has 38,805 pupils within its 90 schools.

- 3.3. Whilst 40% of our residents are from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, this rises to 77.3% within our school population, where over 172 different languages are spoken by our pupils.
- 3.4. Deprivation is increasing in Lewisham relative to other local authorities. The 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation ranked Lewisham 31st out of 354 local authorities in England compared to a rank of 39 in 2007. On the specific indicator of income deprivation affecting children, 35 (out of 166) of Lewisham's super output areas are in the 10% most deprived in the country, and 85 (over half) are in the 20% most deprived in the country. It is estimated that 20,355 children (ages 0-18) live in poverty in Lewisham.
- 3.5. In terms of our young people population, Lewisham's biggest challenge is ensuring they have high aspirations and fulfill their potential. Lewisham continues to make good progress in reducing the number of young people who are NEET, with June, 2014 figures showing 4.2% of our 16-19 year olds as NEET against a London average of 4.1%. Lewisham's 'unknown' NEET figure remains a challenging issue. As of June, 2014, 6.7% of young people's statuses were unknown in relation to education, employment or training. This is slightly higher than the London average for unknowns at 6.5%.
- 3.6. According to the January 2012 Census Data from schools, the numbers of young people with special educational needs in Lewisham is as follows:

| Years | Male | | | Female | | |
|-------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| | Schools action/ early | School action plus | Statement | School action/ early | School action plus | Statement |
| 10-14 | 351 | 248 | 199 | 260 | 125 | 85 |
| 3-14 | 1720 | 1714 | 727 | 1089 | 659 | 258 |

4. Current Provision

- 4.1. The Service offers a mixed economy of Council-run provision and 37 commissioned activities from 35 private and voluntary (PVI) sector providers. This includes youth centres, adventure playgrounds (APGs), targeted holistic one-to-one support and IAG for young people with vulnerabilities, sex and relationship education and support around teenage pregnancy, support for young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) and a range of positive activities.
- 4.2. All settings operate as a 'front door' to targeted support, forming a core part of Lewisham's early intervention and NEET reduction strategies. The overall aim of these strategies is to prevent escalation of need and ensure that young people achieve the best possible outcomes in life.

4.3. The targeted elements of the Service support young people who present with multiple vulnerabilities, with a focus on those who are NEET, or at risk of becoming NEET. Other targeted vulnerabilities include:

- Risk of teenage pregnancy
- Risk of offending or recidivism
- Risk of becoming looked after or homeless
- Risk of misusing substances
- Risk of future or current poor health

4.4. The service works in partnership with other services across the Children’s Partnership. This includes other targeted and specialist services such as Children’s Social Care, the youth offending service, SHIP, local housing providers, Health Visitors, CAMHS, other NEET provision and Job Centre Plus, as well as universal services including schools and colleges, the police and community safety, and GPs.

4.5. As part of the restructure which began in October 2013 the Service is in the process of revamping its data systems. Prior to the restructure reporting was inconsistent and the database flawed, resulting in inaccurate reports. It is expected that this will be fully rectified by the end of Quarter 2 this year as per the restructure plans. In order to consider the impact of these current proposals we are therefore only able to use best estimates based on the partially embedded new system and figures through July.

4.6. May to July figures for 2014/15 show that just over 4,000 individual young people accessed Youth Service provision, including commissioned services running during this period (this excludes the NEET PROGRAMME and specialist 1:1 services). Based on an estimated 8 to 19 population of 37,048 young people, the Service has a reach (i.e. young people attending at least once) of at least 4,000 or 16% of the population. Of these c.2,000 are considered ‘Participants’ (i.e. have attended 3 or more times during this period) representing 8% of the total population, a retention rate of 50%. It is expected that these numbers will increase once summer attendances are reported and all commissioned provision is running. Unfortunately due to the poor quality of data from previous years it is not feasible or useful to offer comparison. Moreover, since this is not nationally collected data we are also unable to benchmark against other local authorities.

4.7. The current structure contains 56.6 FTE (89 people);

| | Current | New | Difference |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Full time equivalents (FTEs) | 56.6 | 50.2 | 6.4 |
| People | 89 | approx 66 | approx 23 |

4.8. The breakdown of current staff in post according to protected characteristics is as follows:

| Equalities group | | No. of staff | Full time | Part time |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| Total | | 89 | 34 | 55 |
| Age | 16-20 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | 21-25 | 20 | 3 | 16 |
| | 26-30 | 9 | 3 | 7 |
| | 31-35 | 17 | 10 | 7 |
| | 36-40 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| | 41-45 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| | 46-50 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| | 51-55 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| | 55+ | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| | New appointments | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Race | Asian Bangladeshi | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | Asian Indian | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Black African | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Black Caribbean | 38 | 11 | 27 |
| | Black Other | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| | Mixed Other | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| | Not known | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | Other Ethnic Group | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | Vietnamese | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | White British/Eng/Welsh/Scot/N.Irish | 14 | 10 | 4 |
| | White Irish | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | White Other | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| | White Turkish / Turkish Cypriot | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Sex | Male | 40 | 13 | 27 |
| | Female | 49 | 21 | 28 |
| Disability | Disability | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| | No disability | 84 | 31 | 53 |

5. Potential Impact: £1.4m savings & Option 1

On young people

5.1 The impact of these proposals on young people is expected to be negative in the short-term, as a result of decreased direct funding and, consequently, less provision and less reach. If an ELM can generate significant income to supplement a Council contract, the impact could prove positive.

5.2 The proposals entail the withdrawal of funding from two Service-run youth centres, as well as a reduction to commissioning, line management and business support capabilities. It is expected that provision would continue in all areas of the Borough, though initially to a lesser extent than before. Provision would continue to be provided directly by Lewisham

staff and within year one by providers commissioned by Lewisham. If the Service then becomes an ELM, commissioning of youth provision would be undertaken by the ELM.

- 5.3 The Service would continue to open up opportunities available to young people in Lewisham and London. These opportunities could increase if an ELM proves successful. Furthermore, as noted, PVI providers could continue to access funding opportunities that are not open to local authorities in order to generate additional funds, which could bolster youth provision.
- 5.4 Young people would have a bigger say in terms of how resources are allocated within the context of a Youth Service ELM. Young people would be elected to board level positions and work on strategy setting in concert with staff members and professionals. Young people would help the Council, ELM and providers deliver services and activities that meet their needs.
- 5.5 A budget reduction equivalent to the removal of 175 hours support youth work and 87.5 senior youth worker hours will result in an end to street based capacity and the removal of direct Youth Service provision in 2 youth clubs. Vacancies in the current staffing structure already inhibit the street-based capacity from operating fully. The remaining Service would have capacity to deliver 5 youth clubs with direct youth service provision from at least 3 youth work staff at each session for 5 nights per week for 3 hours per session. Based on best practice ratios this would allow an open youth club to continue to cater to a maximum 45 young people per night. Although, these numbers would greatly alter depending on the age and needs of the young people and the activities being undertaken. Additional numbers could be enabled via the successful use of an adult volunteer strategy, something the current Service is developing and could be continued through to an ELM. There is no proposed change to APG capacity, which will retain 5 sites operating an average of 24.5 hours per week over 4 nights and Saturdays with 1 senior and 2 support youth workers at each site.

On staff

- 5.6 The proposed new structure contains 50.2 FTE (approximately 66 people). This equates to an estimated reduction of 6.4 FTE's or 23 people. The exact breakdown of people and the effect on protected characteristics is not possible to calculate due to the high number of part time support youth worker contracts and the inability to know the make up of contracts within the altered number of FTE posts .
- 5.7 The proposals would retain alignment with the Council's Single Status Agreement and youth work type roles would be evaluated under the GLPC Scheme and all new posts would continue to be offered on NJC Terms & Conditions (Green Book).
- 5.8 The Youth Service management team and HR are committed to providing support for staff affected by the proposals. The support available will include advice on how to get shortlisted and improve interview skills. Employees will also be able to access additional resources on

the corporate intranet, for example, FAQs. In addition, staff have been advised that they can speak to their line managers or HR representatives around individual issues.

6 Potential Impact: Option 2 – Reduce the Youth Service to a statutory service only model, releasing future savings of £3.16m

On young people

- 6.1 This proposal is expected to have a highly negative impact on young people in the Borough. With its current structure the Service estimates a quarterly reach (see 8.4 above) of around 4,000 young people via both direct and commissioned provision. The Service would no longer be able to reach any young people, either directly or via commissioned provision; although the Service would still facilitate access to provision offered by other providers.

On Staff

- 6.2 Only 4 FTE posts with responsibility for ensuring a statutory duty would be retained, resulting in a loss of 52.6 FTE. Due to the level of reduction, this does not render negative implications for any one particular protected characteristic. The maximum redundancy cost to the Council is estimated at £496k.

On the Service

- 6.3 The Service would only be able to carry out two functions – NEET Tracking and facilitating access to youth provision in the Borough. All other existing functions would end, including: commissioning, business support, partnership work, direct youth provision.

7. Action plan: £1.4m savings

| Issue | Action | Group affected | Owner | Timescale |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| Equality of access | Ensure all remaining youth provision is accessible for all young people. This includes DDA compliance. Provision should be welcoming for all young people regardless of ethnic background, disability, sexual orientation and/or faith. | All | Youth Services, Commissioners | Ongoing but with regards to commissioning timescales for commissioned services (April 2015 to September 2015) |
| Young people with disabilities | Ensure that youth centres and activities are accessible for young people with disabilities. | Disability | Youth Services, Commissioners, commissioned services | Ongoing but with regards to commissioning timescales for commissioned services (April 2015 to September 2015) |
| Communication | Continue to develop and maintain effective communication portals which enable young people to find out easily about youth provision, using social media and other online methods, as well as through schools, colleges and other local organisations. Information must be current, relevant, comprehensive and appealing to young people. There must also be effective communication between the Youth Service, other Council services that support young people and PVI providers to ensure that all partners are aware of the full range of support available to young people and are able to signpost where relevant. | All | Youth Services, Comms team | Ongoing |
| Young people's involvement | Ensure the continued and meaningful engagement of young people in designing, delivering and evaluating youth provision to ensure it is relevant, appealing and meets their changing needs. | Young people | Youth Services, commissioned services | Ongoing |
| Safety | Ensure that all young people are able to access youth provision safely and confidently, with clear risk assessments undertaken for activities as required to ensure safe access. | All | Youth Services, Commissioners, commissioned services | Ongoing |

| Issue | Action | Group affected | Owner | Timescale |
|--|---|---------------------|--|---|
| Staff recruitment, redundancy and redeployment | Ensure a fair and transparent recruitment process for staff with due regard to protected characteristics and issues of diversity and equality. Ensure HR procedures are followed correctly and consistently across the service with regard to recruitment, redundancy and redeployment, in line with the Council's Management of Change Guidelines. | Staff, young people | HR, Youth Services | April 2015 onwards |
| Support for staff affected by the proposals | Ensure that there is support available for staff affected by the proposals, including advice on how to get shortlisted and improve interview skills. In addition to courses available, additional resources must be made available on the corporate intranet, with staff made aware how they access these. Line managers and HR representatives must make themselves available to discuss individual issues with staff. | Staff | HR, Youth Services | November 2014 to April 2015 |
| Commissioning process | Ensure a fair and transparent commissioning and decommissioning process, which ensures services are prioritised to known community needs, values the experience and knowledge of local community groups in delivering youth provision, in addition to measures which ensure continuity and equity of service. Provide clear guidance for providers on the implementation of Lewisham or own policies with regards to equality and diversity issues, and in relation to ensuring equality of access, including confidentiality, safeguarding, safer recruitment, risk etc. | PVI providers | Youth Services, Commissioners, Procurement | November 2014 – April 2015 |
| Transition plan | Develop and implement a robust transition plan for implementation of the changes proposed to ensure continuity of service for young people and a smooth transition to the new service model for staff and PVI organisations impacted by the proposals. | All | Youth Services, Commissioners | November 2014 – full handover of mutual c. 2019 |

| Issue | Action | Group affected | Owner | Timescale |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Volunteer strategy | Develop and implement a robust adult volunteer strategy in order to mitigate the loss of youth work hours across remaining centres. | Staff & community members | Youth Services, Commissioners | November 2014 – ongoing |

8. Action plan: Option 1 – mutualisation

| Issue | Action | Group affected | Owner | Timescale |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| Equality of access | Ensure all remaining youth provision is accessible for all young people. This includes DDA compliance. Provision should be welcoming for all young people regardless of ethnic background, disability, sexual orientation and/or faith. Ensure this is built into planning for an ELM. | All | Youth Services, Commissioners | Ongoing but with regards to commissioning timescales for commissioned services (April 2015 to September 2015) |
| Young people with disabilities | Ensure that youth centres and activities are accessible for young people with disabilities. Ensure this is built into planning for an ELM. | Disability | Youth Services, Commissioners, commissioned services | Ongoing but with regards to commissioning timescales for commissioned services (April 2015 to September 2015) |
| Communication | Continue to develop and maintain effective communication portals which enable young people to find out easily about youth provision, using social media and other online methods, as well as through schools, colleges and other local organisations. Information must be current, relevant, comprehensive and appealing to young people. There must also be effective communication between the Youth Service, other Council services that support young people and PVI providers to ensure that all partners are aware of the full range of support available to young people and are able to signpost where relevant. | All | Youth Services, Comms team | Ongoing |
| Young people's involvement | Ensure the voice and involvement of young people shape the strategy of the ELM and that young people have an elected place on its board. Ensure the continued and meaningful engagement of young people in designing, delivering and evaluating youth provision to ensure it is relevant, appealing and meets their changing needs. | Young people | Youth Services, commissioned services | Ongoing |

| Issue | Action | Group affected | Owner | Timescale |
|--|--|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Safety | Ensure that all young people are able to access youth provision safely and confidently, with clear risk assessments undertaken for activities as required to ensure safe access. Ensure this is built into planning for an ELM. | All | Youth Services, Commissioners, commissioned services | Ongoing |
| Staff recruitment, redundancy and redeployment | Ensure a fair and transparent recruitment process for staff with due regard to protected characteristics and issues of diversity and equality. Ensure HR procedures are followed correctly and consistently across the service with regard to recruitment, redundancy and redeployment, in line with the Council's Management of Change Guidelines. Ensure this is built into planning for an ELM. | Staff, young people | HR, Youth Services | April 2015 onwards |
| Support for staff affected by the proposals | Ensure that there is support available for staff affected by the proposals, including business skills training, advice on how to get shortlisted, improve interview and commercial skills. In addition to courses available, additional resources must be made available on the corporate intranet, with staff made aware how they access these. Line managers and HR representatives must make themselves available to discuss individual issues with staff. | Staff | HR, Youth Services | November 2014 to April 2015 |
| Commissioning process | Ensure a fair and transparent commissioning and decommissioning process, which ensures services are prioritised to known community needs, values the experience and knowledge of local community groups in delivering youth provision, in addition to measures which ensure continuity and equity of service. Provide clear guidance for providers on the implementation of Lewisham or own policies with regards to equality and diversity issues, and in relation to ensuring equality of access, including confidentiality, | PVI providers | Youth Services, Commissioners, Procurement | November 2014 – April 2015 |

| Issue | Action | Group affected | Owner | Timescale |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | safeguarding, safer recruitment, risk etc. | | | |
| Transition plan | Develop and implement a robust transition plan for implementation of the changes proposed to ensure continuity of service for young people and a smooth transition to the new service model for staff and PVI organisations impacted by the proposals. | All | Youth Services, Commissioners | November 2014 – full handover of mutual c. 2019 |
| Volunteer strategy | Develop and implement a robust adult volunteer strategy in order to mitigate the loss of youth work hours across remaining centres. Ensure strategy is transferred to an ELM and further strengthened. | Staff & community members | Youth Services, Commissioners | November 2014 – ongoing |

9. Action plan: Option 2

| Issue | Action | Group affected | Owner | Timescale |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| Communication | Continue to develop and maintain effective communication portals which enable young people to find out easily about youth provision, using social media and other online methods, as well as through schools, colleges and other local organisations. Information must be current, relevant, comprehensive and appealing to young people. There must also be effective communication between the Youth Service, other Council services that support young people and PVI providers to ensure that all partners are aware of the full range of support available to young people and are able to signpost where relevant. | All | Youth Services, Comms team | Ongoing |
| Young people's involvement | Ensure the continued engagement of young people on how information is presented, relevant, appealing and meets their changing needs. Ensure similar engagement to allow successful NEET tracking. | Young people | Youth Services | Ongoing |
| Safety | Ensure that all young people are able to access information about remaining non-Council provided youth provision. | All | Youth Services, | Ongoing |

| Issue | Action | Group affected | Owner | Timescale |
|--|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Staff recruitment, redundancy and redeployment | Ensure a fair and transparent recruitment process for staff with due regard to protected characteristics and issues of diversity and equality. Ensure HR procedures are followed correctly and consistently across the service with regard to recruitment, redundancy and redeployment, in line with the Council's Management of Change Guidelines. | Staff, young people | HR, Youth Services | April 2015 onwards |
| Support for staff affected by the proposals | Ensure that there is support available for staff affected by the proposals. In addition to courses available, additional resources must be made available on the corporate intranet, with staff made aware how they access these. HR representatives must make themselves available to discuss individual issues with staff. | Staff | HR | November 2014 to April 2015 |
| Commissioning process | Ensure a fair and transparent decommissioning process. Provide clear guidance for providers on the implementation of Lewisham or own policies with regards to equality and diversity issues, and in relation to ensuring equality of access, including confidentiality, safeguarding, safer recruitment, risk etc. | PVI providers | Youth Services, Commissioners, Procurement | November 2014 – April 2015 |
| Transition plan | Develop and implement a robust transition plan for implementation of the changes proposed to ensure support for staff, young people and PVI organisations impacted by the proposals. | All | Youth Services, Commissioners | November 2014 – April 2015 |



This guidance has been updated to reflect the new equality duty which came into force on 5 April 2011. It provides advice about the general equality duty.

0B 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 new public sector equality duty (the equality duty) does not prevent you from making difficult decisions such as reorganisations and relocations, redundancies, and service reductions, nor does it stop you from making decisions which may affect one group more than another group. The equality duty enables you to demonstrate that you are making financial decisions in a fair, transparent and accountable way, considering the needs and the rights of different members of your community. This is achieved through assessing the impact that changes to policies, procedures and practices could have on different protected groups (or protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010).

Assessing the impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is not just something that the law requires, it is a positive opportunity for you as a public authority leader to ensure you make better decisions based on robust evidence.

1B 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 groups covered by the equality duty are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The duty also covers marriage and civil partnerships, but only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination.

The law requires that public authorities demonstrate that they have had 'due regard' to the aims of the equality duty in their decision-making. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which public authorities can demonstrate that they have had 'due regard'.

It is also important to note that public authorities subject to the equality duty are also likely to be subject to the Human Rights Act. We would therefore recommend that public authorities consider the potential impact their decisions could have on human rights.

2BAim of this guide

This guide aims to assist decision-makers in ensuring that:

- The process they follow to assess the impact on equality of financial proposals is robust, and
- The impact that financial proposals could have on protected groups is thoroughly considered before any decisions are arrived at.

We have also produced detailed guidance for those responsible for assessing the impact on equality of their policies, which is available on our website:

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/EqualityAct/PSED/equality_analysis_guidance.pdf

3BThe benefits of assessing the impact on equality

By law, your assessments of impact on equality must:

- Contain enough information to enable a public authority to demonstrate it has had 'due regard' to the aims of the equality duty in its decision-making
- Consider ways of mitigating or avoiding any adverse impacts.

Such assessments do not have to take the form of a document called an equality impact assessment. If you choose not to develop a document of this type, then some alternative approach which systematically assesses any adverse impacts of a change in policy, procedure or practice will be required.

Assessing impact on equality is not an end in itself and it should be tailored to, and be proportionate to, the decision that is being made.

Whether it is proportionate for an authority to conduct an assessment of the impact on equality of a financial decision or not depends on its relevance to the authority's particular function and its likely impact on people from the protected groups.

We recommend that you document your assessment of the impact on equality when developing financial proposals. This will help you to:

- **Ensure you have a written record of the equality considerations** you have taken into account.
- **Ensure that your decision includes a consideration of the actions that would help to avoid or mitigate any impacts on particular protected groups.** Individual decisions should also be informed by the wider context of decisions in your own and other relevant public authorities, so that particular groups are not unduly affected by the cumulative effects of different decisions.
- **Make your decisions based on evidence:** a decision which is informed by relevant local and national information about equality is a better quality decision. Assessments of impact on equality provide a clear and systematic way to collect, assess and put forward relevant evidence.

- **Make the decision-making process more transparent:** a process which involves those likely to be affected by the policy, and which is based on evidence, is much more open and transparent. This should also help you secure better public understanding of the difficult decisions you will be making in the coming months.

- **Comply with the law:** a written record can be used to demonstrate that due regard has been had. Failure to meet the equality duty may result in authorities being exposed to costly, time-consuming and reputation-damaging legal challenges.

4BWhen should your assessments be carried out?

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

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

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

5BWhat should I be looking for in my assessments?

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

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

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

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

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

Joint working with your public authority partners will also help you to consider thoroughly the impact of your joint decisions on the people you collectively serve.

Example: A local authority takes separate decisions to limit the eligibility criteria for community care services; increase charges for respite services; scale back its accessible housing programme; and cut concessionary travel. Each separate decision may have a significant effect on the lives of disabled residents, and the cumulative impact of these decisions may be considerable. This combined impact would not be apparent if the decisions were considered in isolation.

• **Has the assessment considered available evidence?**

Public authorities should consider the information and research already available locally and nationally. The assessment of impact on equality should be underpinned by up-to-date and reliable information about the different protected groups that the proposal is likely to have an impact on. A lack of information is not a sufficient reason to conclude that there is no impact.

• **Have those likely to be affected by the proposal been engaged?**

Engagement is crucial to assessing the impact on equality. There is no explicit requirement to engage people under the equality duty, but it will help you to improve the equality information that you use to understand the possible impact on your policy on different protected groups. No-one can give you a better insight into how proposed changes will have an impact on, for example, disabled people, than disabled people themselves.

• **Have potential positive and negative impacts been identified?**

It is not enough to state simply that a policy will impact on everyone equally; there should be a more in-depth consideration of available evidence to see if particular protected groups are more likely to be affected than others. Equal treatment does not always produce equal outcomes; sometimes authorities will have to take particular steps for certain groups to address an existing disadvantage or to meet differing needs.

• **What course of action does the assessment suggest that I take? Is it justifiable?**

The assessment should clearly identify the option(s) chosen, and their potential impacts, and document the reasons for this decision. There are four possible outcomes of an assessment of the impact on equality, and more than one may apply to a single proposal:

Outcome 1: No major change required when the assessment has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to advance equality have been taken.

Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers identified by the assessment or to better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified?

Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified some potential for adverse impacts or missed opportunities to advance equality. In this case, the justification should be included in the assessment and should be in line with the duty to have 'due regard'. For the most important relevant policies, compelling reasons will be needed. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact, as discussed below.

Outcome 4: Stop and rethink when an assessment shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination.

• Are there plans to alleviate any negative impacts?

Where the assessment indicates a potential negative impact, consideration should be given to means of reducing or mitigating this impact. This will in practice be supported by the development of an action plan to reduce impacts. This should identify the responsibility for delivering each action and the associated timescales for implementation. Considering what action you could take to avoid any negative impact is crucial, to reduce the likelihood that the difficult decisions you will have to take in the near future do not create or perpetuate inequality.

Example: A University decides to close down its childcare facility to save money, particularly given that it is currently being under-used. It identifies that doing so will have a negative impact on women and individuals from different racial groups, both staff and students.

In order to mitigate such impacts, the University designs an action plan to ensure relevant information on childcare facilities in the area is disseminated to staff and students in a timely manner. This will help to improve partnership working with the local authority and to ensure that sufficient and affordable childcare remains accessible to its students and staff.

• Are there plans to monitor the actual impact of the proposal?

Although assessments of impact on equality will help to anticipate a proposal's likely effect on different communities and groups, in reality the full impact of a decision will only be known once it is introduced. It is therefore important to set out arrangements for reviewing the actual impact of the proposals once they have been implemented.

6B What happens if you don't properly assess the impact on equality of relevant decisions?

If you have not carried out an assessment of impact on equality of the proposal, or have not done so thoroughly, you risk leaving yourself open to legal challenges, which are both costly and time-consuming. Recent legal cases have shown what can happen when authorities do not consider their equality duties when making decisions.

Example: A court recently overturned a decision by Haringey Council to consent to a large-scale building redevelopment in Wards Corner in Tottenham, on the basis that the council had not considered the impact of the proposal on different racial groups before granting planning permission.


However, the result can often be far more fundamental than a legal challenge. If people feel that an authority is acting high-handedly or without properly involving its service users or employees, or listening to their concerns, they are likely to become disillusioned with you.

Above all, authorities which fail to carry out robust assessments of the impact on equality risk making poor and unfair decisions that could discriminate against particular protected groups and perpetuate or worsen inequality.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Children's Centres in the London Borough of Lewisham



Area 1 and 2 Provider: The Children's Society

CC Leader: Christine Fisher 020 8691 1777, christine.fisher@thechildrenssociety.org.uk

- 2 Evelyn Children's Centre**, 231, Grove St, Deptford, SE8 3PZ, 020 8691 1064
- 3 Amersham Children's Centre**, 75 Amersham Rd, New Cross, SE14 5AE, 020 8691 1777
- 4 Besson Street Children's Centre**, Besson St Gardens, New Cross, SE14 6QQ (contact Evelyn CC)
- 5 Hatcham Oak Children's Centre**, 29 Wallbuton Rd, Brockley, SE4 2NX, 020 7732 8803
- 6 Heathside and Lethbridge Children's Centre**, Melville House, Sparta St, SE10 8DP, 020 8694 1287
- 7 Ladywell Children's Centre**, 30 Rushey Mead, Ladywell, SE4 1JJ, 020 8690 6696
- 8 St. Swithun's Children's Centre**, Hither Green Lane, SE13 6RW (contact Evelyn CC)
- 9 Manor House Children's Centre**, Old Rd, Lee, SE13 6RW, 020 8852 5408

Area 3 and 4 Provider: Pre-School Learning Alliance

CC Leader: Loscinia Smarth 020 8698 3800, loscinia.smarth@pre-school.org.uk


- 11 Torridon Children's Centre**, 103 Torridon Rd, Catford, SE6 1RQ, 020 8695 9648
- 12 Bellingham Children's Centre**, 109a Randlesdown Rd, Bellingham, SE6 3HB, 020 8695 6236

School Run Children's Centres

- 1 Clyde Early Childhood Centre** Alverton St, Deptford, SE8 5NH
CC Leader: Cathryn Kinsey 020 8692 3653, cmanager@clyde.lewisham.sch.uk
- 10 Beecroft Garden Children's Centre** Beecroft Rd, Brockley, SE4 2BS
CC Leader: Victoria Horner 020 8694 4958, vhorne2.209@lgflmail.org
- 13 Downderry Children's Centre** Shroffold Rd, Downham, BR1 5PD
CC Leader: Emily Arnold 020 8695 5915, earnold6.209@lgflmail.org
- 14 Marvels Lane Children's Centre** Riddons Rd, Grove Park, SE12 9R
CC Leader: Christine Turner 020 8851 2129, cturner18.209@lgflmail.org
- 15 Kelvin Grove and Eliot Bank Children's Centre [Jointly Managed]**
Kelvin Grove Children's Centre Site, Kirkdale, Sydenham, SE26 6BB
Eliot Bank Children's Centre Site, Thorpewood Avenue, Sydenham, SE26 4BU
CC Leader: Jess Towlson 020 8613 0172, jtowlson@kelvingrove.lewisham.sch.uk
- 17 Kilmorrie Children's Centre** Kilmorrie Road, Forest Hill, SE23 2SP
CC Leader: Regan Lacey 020 8699 7802, rlacey@kilmorrie.lewisham.sch.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Lewisham Youth Services



All Enquiries & Further Information:

Lewisham Youth Services
Third floor
Laurence House
SE6 4RU

TEL:020 8314 9543 Email:youthservice@lewisham.gov.uk
www.lewisham.gov.uk

- NORTH (AREA 1)**
- 1. Riverside Youth Club (D)
- 2. Woodpecker Youth Club (D)
- 3. Honor Oak Youth Club (D)

- CENTRAL (AREA 2)**
- 1. Baseline (Drop in)(D)
- 2. Youth Village Centre (D)

- SOUTH WEST (AREA 4)**
- 1. Rockbourne Youth Club (D)
- 2. Bellingham Gateway Youth Club (D)
- 3. TNG Youth Club (D)

- ADVENTURE PLAYGROUNDS:**
- 1. Deptford Adventure Playground (D)
- 2. Honor Oak Adventure Playground (D)
- 3. Home Park Adventure Playground (D)
- 4. Dumps Adventure Playground (D)
- 5. Ladywell Fields Adventure Playground (D)

D: Youth facilities directly managed by London Borough of Lewisham Youth Services

Other facilities are funded by Youth Services and details can be obtained from our web site or by phoning the number above

This page is intentionally left blank

Lewisham Future Programme Proposals

October/November 2014

Scrutiny navigation sheet

Overview & Scrutiny: Monday 29 September 7.30pm
Housing: Wednesday 1 October 7.30pm
Children & Young People: Thursday 02 October 6.30pm
Healthier Communities: Tuesday 21 October 7.00pm
Sustainable Development: Thursday 30 October 7.00pm
Safer Stronger Communities: Monday 3 November 7.00pm
Public Accounts: Wednesday 5 November 7.00pm

(Mayor and Cabinet) Wednesday 12 November

| Savings required | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| £m | 39 | 26 | 20 | 85 |

| Review of Savings proposals | Children & Young People | Healthier | Housing | Public Accounts | Safer Stronger | Sustainable |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Select Ctte. | 2 Oct | 21 Oct | 1 Oct | 5 Nov | 3 Nov | 30 Oct |
| M&C | 12 Nov | 12 Nov | 12 Nov | 12 Nov | 12 Nov | 12 Nov |
| Select Ctte. | 15 Dec | 2 Dec | 17 Dec | 10 Dec | 3 Dec | 9 Dec |
| M&C | 14 Jan | 3 Dec | 14 Jan | 14 Jan | 14 Jan | 14 Jan |
| Select Ctte. | 4 Feb | 14 Jan | 28 Jan | 5 Feb + Budget | 22 Jan | 20 Jan |
| M&C | 11 Feb | 11 Feb | 11 Feb | 11 Feb + Budget | 11 Feb | 11 Feb |

The table below presents the current position. It summarises the savings position for each of the LFP work strands for 15/16 (previously agreed, proposed and expected) and proposals for the future years 16/17 and 17/18.

| LFP Area | 15/16 | 15/16 | 15/16 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 |
|------------------|-------|--------|------------|---------------|---------|---------|
| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| | Prev. | Prop. | Expect. | Total | Prop. | Prop. |
| Proposals | 1,680 | 29,426 | 770 | 31,876 | 6,462 | 4,696 |
| Target | 1,680 | 37,320 | | 39,000 | 26,000 | 20,000 |
| Gap | 0 | -7,894 | | -7,124 | -19,538 | -15,304 |

| LFP Area | LFP work strand | Number of proposals (proformas) in this report |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Smarter & deeper integration of social care & health (incl. Public Health) | 10 |
| B | Supporting people | 1 |
| C | Sharing services (incl. third party spend) | 0 |
| D | Efficiency review | 0 |
| E | Asset rationalisation | 5 |
| F | Corporate and business support services | 1 |
| G | Income generation | 1 |
| H | Enforcement and regulation | 1 |
| I | Management and corporate overheads | 1 |
| J | School effectiveness services | 1 |
| K | Crime reduction | 3 |
| L | Culture and community services | 2 |
| M | Housing strategy and non-HRA funded services | 1 |
| N | Environmental services | 2 |
| O | Public services | 3 |
| P | Planning and economic development | 1 |
| Q | Safeguarding and early intervention services | 2 |
| R | Customer transformation | 0 |
| | Total | 35 |

Index for the full report and appendices

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Lewisham Future Programme: Scrutiny Process | page 1 |
| Lewisham Future Programme 2015/16 Revenue Budget Savings Report | page 3 |
| Appendix 1 – Savings proposals for scrutiny | page37 |
| Appendix 2 – Context for Community Services savings relating to the transformation of Adult Social care | page 193 |
| Appendix 3 – Consultation on charging for disabled persons Blue Badge | page 198 |
| Appendix 4 – Consultation on proposed removal of discretionary Freedom Pass scheme | page 201 |
| Appendix 5 – Early Intervention and Safeguarding savings proposals | page 205 |
| Appendix 6 – Savings proposals and the future of the Youth Service | page 228 |
| Appendix 7 – Making fair financial decisions | page 259 |
| Map of Children’s Centres in Lewisham | page 267 |
| Map of Lewisham Youth Services | page 269 |

Housing: Wednesday 1 October 7.30pm

| Ref | Brief description of savings proposal | 15/16 (£000's) | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total | Staff consult | Public consult | Page | Other Scrutiny |
|-----|--|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|----------------|------|---|
| M1 | Transfer of non-housing stock from the HRA to the general fund | 700 | 200 | 100 | 1,000 | N | N | 154 | Sustainable Development |
| B1 | Reduction and remodelling of supporting people housing and floating support services | 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 | 2,523 | N | Y | 84 | Healthier Communities Safer Stronger Communities |

Children & Young People: Thursday 2 October 6.30pm

| Ref | Brief description of savings proposal | 15/16 (£000's) | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total | Staff consult | Public consult | Page | Other Scrutiny |
|--------|---|--|-------|-------|-------|---------------|----------------|------|----------------|
| J1 | Increasing income from educational psychologists and learning difficulties teams | 751 | 0 | 0 | 751 | N | N | 131 | |
| K2 | Youth Offending Service (YOS) reorganisation, changes in interventions and reduction in contracts | 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 | Y | N | 139 | |
| Q1 | Improve triage for Children's Social Care services & re-design Children Centre & Early Intervention offer | 973 (4,181 savings of which 3,208 will be used for the re-setting of the CSC placements budget) | 1,223 | 111 | 5,515 | Y | Y | 178 | |
| Q1 Sup | Improving triage for Children's social care services and redesigning children's centre and early intervention offer | 3,208 | 0 | 0 | 3,208 | Y | Y | 184 | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|
| Q2 | Reduction in youth service provision | Option 1: 1,406 Option 2: 3,160 | 0 | 0 | Option 1: 1,406 (a further saving of 1,754 from 2019/20 is proposed after 3 years) Option 2: 3,160 | Y | Y | 187 | |
| A6 | Public Health programme review (1) | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | N | Y | 59 | Healthier Communities |
| A8 | Public Health programme review (2) | 1,777 | 0 | 0 | 1,777 | Y | Y | 69 | Healthier Communities |
| G1 | Increasing income from schools SLA, Debt collection and Investment strategy (inc blue badges) | 974 | 0 | 0 | 974 | N | Y | 114 | Public Accounts Safer Stronger Communities |

Healthier Communities: Tuesday 21 October 7pm

| Ref | Brief description of savings proposal | 15/16 (£000's) | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total | Staff consult | Public consult | Page | Other Scrutiny |
|-----|--|----------------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|----------------|------|-------------------------|
| A1 | Cost effective care packages | 2,680 | 0 | 0 | 2,680 | N | Y | 39 | |
| A2 | Reduction in cost of learning disability provision | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | N | Y | 43 | |
| A3 | Changes to sensory services | 150 | 0 | 0 | 150 | Y | Y | 48 | |
| A4 | Remodelling building based day services | 1,300 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | Y | Y | 52 | |
| A5 | Charging for adult social care services | 275 | 0 | 0 | 275 | N | Y | 56 | |
| A6 | Public Health programme review (1) | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | N | Y | 59 | Children & Young People |
| A7 | Cost effective care for mental health | 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 | N | N | 65 | |
| A8 | Public Health programme review (2) | 1,777 | 0 | 0 | 1,777 | Y | Y | 69 | Children & Young People |
| A9 | Review of services to support people to live at home | 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 | Y | N | 77 | |
| A10 | Proposal in respect of recouping health costs | 600 | 0 | 0 | 600 | N | N | 80 | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-------|-------|---|-------|---|---|-----|--|
| B1 | Reduction and remodelling of supporting people housing and floating support services | 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 | 2,523 | N | Y | 84 | Housing Safer Stronger Communities |
| K1 | Retendering and targeted reduction in drug and alcohol services | 574 | 30 | 0 | 604 | Y | N | 135 | Safer Stronger Communities |

Sustainable Development: Thursday 30 October 7pm

| Ref | Brief description of savings proposal | 15/16 (£000's) | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total | Staff consult | Public consult | Page | Other Scrutiny |
|-----|---|----------------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|----------------|------|----------------------------|
| E2 | Optimisation of operational estate | 190 | 305 | 670 | 1,165 | N | N | 94 | Public Accounts |
| E3 | Creating income from asset portfolio | 0 | 0 | 200 | 200 | Y | N | 98 | Public Accounts |
| E4 | Improving rent collection for commercial assets | 50 | 445 | 100 | 595 | N | N | 102 | Public Accounts |
| E5 | Energy efficiency measures | 109 | 10 | 15 | 134 | N | Y | 106 | |
| H1 | Restructuring of enforcement and regulatory services | 800 | 0 | 0 | 800 | Y | N | 119 | Safer Stronger Communities |
| N1 | Reduction in maintenance of some small parks, highways and reduced management costs | 340 | 0 | 0 | 340 | Y | N | 158 | |
| N2 | Reduction in street cleansing frequencies and cleansing management costs | 400 | 0 | 0 | 400 | Y | N | 161 | |
| P1 | Restructure of the Planning Service | 229 | 0 | 0 | 229 | Y | N | 174 | |
| M1 | Transfer of non-housing stock from the HRA to the general fund | 700 | 200 | 100 | 1,000 | N | N | 154 | Housing |

Safer Stronger: Monday 3 November 7pm

| Ref | Brief description of savings proposal | 15/16 (£000's) | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total | Staff consult | Public consult | Page | Other Scrutiny |
|-----|---|----------------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|----------------|------|---|
| K3 | Reduction in funding for integrated offender management service | 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 | N | N | 143 | |
| L1 | Review of main VCS grants programme | 1,125 | 375 | 0 | 1500 | N | Y | 147 | |
| L2 | Libraries Staff reorganisation (subject to TOR change approval by Council) | 280 | 0 | 0 | 280 | Y | N | 151 | |
| O1 | End the discretionary freedom pass scheme | 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 | N | Y | 164 | |
| B1 | Reduction and remodelling of supporting people housing and floating support services | 1,349 | 1,174 | 0 | 2,523 | N | Y | 84 | Healthier Communities Safer Stronger Communities |
| K1 | Retendering and targeted reduction in drug and alcohol services | 574 | 30 | 0 | 604 | Y | N | 135 | Healthier Communities |
| G1 | Increasing income from schools SLA, Debt collection and Investment strategy (inc blue badges) | 974 | 0 | 0 | 974 | N | Y | 114 | Children & Young People Public Accounts |
| H1 | Restructuring of enforcement and regulatory services | 800 | 0 | 0 | 800 | Y | N | 119 | Sustainable Development |

Public Accounts: Wednesday 5 November 7pm

| Ref | Brief description of savings proposal | 15/16 (£000's) | 16/17 | 17/18 | Total | Staff consult | Public consult | Page | Other Scrutiny |
|-----|--|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|----------------|------|---|
| E1 | Structural re-organisation of the Regeneration & Asset Management Division | 600 | 0 | 0 | 600 | Y | N | 91 | |
| F1 | Centralisation of business support services | 900 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,900 | Y | N | 110 | |
| G1 | Increasing income from schools SLA, Debt collection and Investment strategy (inc blue badges) | 974 | 0 | 0 | 974 | N | Y | 114 | Children & Young People Safer Stronger Communities |
| I1 | Reduction in corporate management and professional support services | 2,090 | 0 | 0 | 2,090 | Y | N | 123 | |
| O2 | Reduction in staffing for parking contract client team | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | N | N | 168 | |
| O3 | Set up an internal "enforcement agency" (bailiff) service to collect council tax and other debts | 400 | 200 | 0 | 600 | N | N | 171 | |

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

| Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------|---|
| Title | Select Committee work programme | | |
| Contributor | Scrutiny Manager | Item | 5 |
| Class | Part 1 (Open) | 03 November 2014 | |

1. Purpose

To advise Members of the proposed work programme for the municipal year 2014/15, and to decide on the agenda items for the next meeting.

2. Summary

- 2.1 At the beginning of the new administration, each select committee drew up a draft work programme for submission to the Business Panel for consideration.
- 2.2 The Business Panel considered the proposed work programmes of each of the select committees on 29 July 2014 and agreed a co-ordinated overview and scrutiny work programme. However, the work programme can be reviewed at each Select Committee meeting so that Members are able to include urgent, high priority items and remove items that are no longer a priority.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The Committee is asked to:

- note the work plan attached at **Appendix B** and discuss any issues arising from the programme;
- specify the information and analysis required in the report for each item on the agenda for the next meeting, based on desired outcomes, so that officers are clear on what they need to provide;
- review all forthcoming key decisions, attached at **Appendix C**, and consider any items for further scrutiny.
- review the scoping report, attached at **Appendix D**, discuss the objectives of the review and agree terms of reference.

4. The work programme

4.1 The work programme for 2014/15 was agreed at the Committee's meeting on 15 July 2014.

4.2 The Committee is asked to consider if any urgent issues have arisen that require scrutiny and if any existing items are no longer a priority and can be removed from the work programme. Before adding additional items, each item should be considered against agreed criteria. The flow chart attached at **Appendix A** may help Members decide if proposed additional items should be added to the work programme. The Committee's work programme needs to be achievable in terms of the amount of meeting time available. If the Committee agrees to add additional

item(s) because they are urgent and high priority, Members will need to consider which medium/low priority item(s) should be removed in order to create sufficient capacity for the new item(s).

5. The next meeting

5.1 The following reports are scheduled for the meeting on 03 December 2014:

| Agenda item | Review type | Link to Corporate Priority | Priority |
|---|-----------------|---|----------|
| Violence against women and girls: evidence session | In-depth review | Safety, security and a visible presence | High |
| Responsible dog ownership | Standard review | Community leadership; safety, security and a visible presence | High |

5.2 The Committee is asked to specify the information and analysis it would like to see in the reports for these item, based on the outcomes the committee would like to achieve, so that officers are clear on what they need to provide for the next meeting.

6. Financial Implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

7. Legal Implications

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, all scrutiny select committees must devise and submit a work programme to the Business Panel at the start of each municipal year.

8. Equalities Implications

8.1 The Equality Act 2010 brought together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act included a new public sector equality duty, replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

8.2 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.

- 8.3 There may be equalities implications arising from items on the work programme and all activities undertaken by the Select Committee will need to give due consideration to this.

9. Date of next meeting


The date of the next meeting is Wednesday 3 December 2014

Background Documents

Lewisham Council's Constitution

Centre for Public Scrutiny: the Good Scrutiny Guide

Scrutiny work programme – prioritisation process



Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee work programme 2014/15

Programme of work

| Work item | Type of item | Priority | Strategic priority | Delivery deadline | 15-Jul | 10-Sep | 03-Nov | 03-Dec | 03-Feb | 04-Mar |
|---|----------------------------|----------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|----------|--------|
| Lewisham Future Programme | Standard item | High | CP10 | Jul | | | | | | |
| Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair | Constitutional requirement | High | CP10 | Jul | | | | | | |
| Select Committee work programme | Standard item | High | CP10 | Jul | | | | | | |
| Council employment profile | Standard item | Medium | CP10 | Jul | | | | | | |
| Main grant programme funding | Standard item | High | CP1 | Nov | | | | | | |
| Safer Lewisham Partnership plan and update | Standard item | Medium | CP4 | Sep | | | | | | |
| Violence against women and girls | In-depth review | High | CP4/CP9 | Mar | | Update | Scope | evidence | evidence | Report |
| Probation service update | Standard item | Medium | CP4 | Jan | | | | | | |
| Responsible dog ownership | Standard review | Medium | CP4 | Dec | | | | | | |
| Emergency services review update | Standard item | High | CP4 | Jan | | | | | | |
| Invitation to Borough Fire and Police Commanders | Performance monitoring | Medium | CP4 | Jan | | | | | | |
| Local Assemblies report | Performance monitoring | Medium | CP1 | Jan | | | | | | |
| Implmentation of the volunteering strategy | Performance monitoring | Medium | CP9 | Mar | | | | | | |
| Provision for the LGBT community | Standard review | Medium | CP1 | Mar | | | | | | |
| Safer Lewisham Strategy - monitoring and update | Performance monitoring | High | CP4 | Mar | | | | | | |
| Comprehensive Equalities Scheme - monitoring and update | Performance monitoring | Medium | CP10 | Mar | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| | Item completed |
| | Item ongoing |
| | Item outstanding |
| | Proposed timeframe |
| | Item added |

| Meetings | | | | | |
|----------|-----|--------------|----|-----|-------------|
| 1) | Tue | 15 July | 4) | Wed | 03 December |
| 2) | Wed | 10 September | 5) | Tue | 03 February |
| 3) | Mon | 03 November | 6) | Wed | 04 March |

| Shaping Our Future: Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2020 | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------|
| | Priority | |
| 1 | Ambitious and achieving | SCS 1 |
| 2 | Safer | SCS 2 |
| 3 | Empowered and responsible | SCS 3 |
| 4 | Clean, green and liveable | SCS 4 |
| 5 | Healthy, active and enjoyable | SCS 5 |
| 6 | Dynamic and prosperous | SCS 6 |

| Corporate Priorities | | |
|----------------------|--|-------|
| | Priority | |
| 1 | Community Leadership | CP 1 |
| 2 | Young people's achievement and involvement | CP 2 |
| 3 | Clean, green and liveable | CP 3 |
| 4 | Safety, security and a visible presence | CP 4 |
| 5 | Strengthening the local economy | CP 5 |
| 6 | Decent homes for all | CP 6 |
| 7 | Protection of children | CP 7 |
| 8 | Caring for adults and older people | CP 8 |
| 9 | Active, healthy citizens | CP 9 |
| 10 | Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity | CP 10 |

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

Forward Plan November 2014 - February 2015

This Forward Plan sets out the key decisions the Council expects to take during the next four months.

Anyone wishing to make representations on a decision should submit them in writing as soon as possible to the relevant contact officer (shown as number (7) in the key overleaf). Any representations made less than 3 days before the meeting should be sent to Kevin Flaherty, the Local Democracy Officer, at the Council Offices or kevin.flaherty@lewisham.gov.uk. However the deadline will be 4pm on the working day prior to the meeting.

A "key decision"* means an executive decision which is likely to:

- (a) result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates;
- (b) be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards.

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| September 2014 | Appointment of contractor 28 Deptford High Street | Tuesday, 14/10/14 Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| August 2014 | 144 Evelyn Street (Parker House) Surplus Declaration and Approval to Demolish | Wednesday, 22/10/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| September 2014 | Proposal to enlarge Holbeach Primary School: Design Progress | Wednesday, 22/10/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| August 2014 | Making of Instrument of Government St. Michael's Church of England Primary School | Wednesday, 22/10/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| September 2014 | Mayor of London's Infrastructure Plan 2050 - Consultation response | Wednesday, 22/10/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| September 2014 | Winter Maintenance Policy and Plan 2014/15 | Wednesday, 22/10/14 | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & | | |

| FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
| | | Mayor and Cabinet | Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| September 2014 | Deployable Temporary Accommodation | Wednesday, 22/10/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| September 2014 | Determination of application neighbourhood forum and neighbourhood area Grove Park | Wednesday, 22/10/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| September 2014 | Contracts awards enlargement of Holbeach Primary School and Coopers Lane Primary School | Wednesday, 22/10/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| October 2014 | Contract Award Coopers Lane Primary School 2FE to 3FE | Tuesday, 04/11/14 Overview and Scrutiny Education Business Panel | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| September 2014 | Drumbeat 6th Form School: Phase 3 New Build | Tuesday, 04/11/14 Overview and Scrutiny Education Business Panel | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Paul Maslin, | | |

| FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
| | | | Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| September 2014 | Procurement of a Corporate Scanning Service Provider | Tuesday, 04/11/14 Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| September 2014 | Deptford Southern Sites Regeneration Project | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| September 2014 | Introduction of a Borough 20mph zone | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| May 2014 | Kenton Court and Somerville Extra Care Schemes: Update | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| October 2014 | Mid Year Treasury Strategy | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |

| FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
| October 2014 | 2015-16 Revenue Budget Savings | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| October 2014 | Proposal to enlarge St George's CE Primary School, Forster Park Primary School and Sir Francis Drake Primary School | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| May 2014 | Education Contract Awards ICT Specialist Service Provider Framework | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| September 2014 | Corporate Energy Contracts | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Rachel Onikosi, Cabinet Member Public Realm | | |
| September 2014 | Learning Contract Provider | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| October 2014 | Prendergast Primary School Permission to spend on enabling works | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| October 2014 | Extension on all learning disability supported accommodation contracts | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Chris Best, Cabinet Member Health-Well-Being-Older People | | |
| October 2014 | Extension of contract with Turner & Townsend (Primary Places Programme) | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| September 2014 | Supporting the Voluntary Sector - outcome main grants consultation and approval to open main grants programme for applications | Wednesday, 12/11/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Joan Millbank, Cabinet Member Third Sector & Community | | |
| October 2014 | Award of contract for works at Kelvin Grove Primary (Primary Places Programme) | Tuesday, 25/11/14 Overview and Scrutiny Education Business Panel | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| June 2014 | Annual Parking Review | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Rachel Onikosi, Cabinet Member Public Realm | | |
| October 2014 | Approval public consultation Lewisham River Corridors Improvement Plan SPD | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| September 2014 | Campshill Road Extra Care Scheme | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| September 2014 | Church Grove Custom Build | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| October 2014 | Council Tax Reduction Scheme Review | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| August 2014 | Customer Service centre out of hours switchboard Procurement | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and | | |

| FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
| | | | Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| September 2014 | Deptford Southern Sites Regeneration Project | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| September 2014 | Draft Flood Management Strategy | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| October 2014 | Housing Acquisition Programme Update | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| October 2014 | Ladywell Playtower | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| June 2014 | Surrey Canal Triangle - Compulsory Purchase Order Resolution | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| October 2014 | Award of Highways Public Realm Contract Coulgate Street | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and | | |

| FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
| | | (Contracts) | Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| September 2014 | Award of Street advertising and Bus Shelter Contract | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| August 2014 | Extension of Drug and Alcohol contract | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Janet Daby, Cabinet Member Community Safety | | |
| August 2014 | Award of 3 drug and alcohol contracts: young People, Aftercare, Shared Care | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Janet Daby, Cabinet Member Community Safety | | |
| August 2014 | Award of Single Violence against Women and Girls Service Contract | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Janet Daby, Cabinet Member Community Safety | | |
| October 2014 | Procurement of the School Kitchen Maintenance Contract | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young | | |

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | People | | |
| October 2014 | School Minor Capital Works Programme 2013-14 | Wednesday, 03/12/14 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| October 2014 | Annual Complaints Report | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Joe Dromey, Cabinet Member Policy & Performance | | |
| March 2014 | Community Infrastructure Levy Adoption version | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| October 2014 | 2015-16 Council Tax Base | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| October 2014 | 2015/16 NNDR Base Report | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |

| FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
| October 2014 | 2015-16 Revenue Budget Savings | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| October 2014 | Highways Asset Management Plan - Corporate Aims, Policy, Investment, Performance and Engagement | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| September 2014 | Housing Regeneration | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| March 2014 | Planning Obligations SPD Adoption Version | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| March 2014 | Review of Blackheath Events Policy 2011 | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Rachel Onikosi, Cabinet Member Public Realm | | |
| September 2014 | Strategic Asset Management Plan 2015-2020 | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and | | |

| FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
| | | | Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| October 2014 | Award of Design and Build Contract Phase 1 Grove Park Public Realm Project | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |
| October 2014 | Procurement of the School Catering Contract service | Wednesday, 14/01/15 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |
| October 2014 | 2015-16 Council Tax Base | Wednesday, 21/01/15 Council | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| October 2014 | Council Tax Reduction Scheme Review | Wednesday, 21/01/15 Council | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| October 2014 | 2015/16 NNDR Base Report | Wednesday, 21/01/15 Council | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor | | |

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| October 2014 | Milford Towers Update | Wednesday, 11/02/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| October 2014 | New Homes Better Places Funding Update | Wednesday, 11/02/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| October 2014 | Budget 2015-16 | Wednesday, 11/02/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| October 2014 | Rent Setting | Wednesday, 11/02/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| October 2014 | Pay Policy Statement | Wednesday, 11/02/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Andreas Ghosh, Head of Personnel & Development and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| October 2014 | Budget Update 2015-16 | Wednesday, 18/02/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and | | |

| FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date included in forward plan | Description of matter under consideration | Date of Decision Decision maker | Responsible Officers / Portfolios | Consultation Details | Background papers / materials |
| | | | Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources | | |
| September 2014 | Prevention and Inclusion Contract Extension and Commissioning Recommendation | Wednesday, 04/03/15 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Chris Best, Cabinet Member Health- Well-Being-Older People | | |
| June 2014 | Housing Strategy 2015 - 2020 | Wednesday, 04/03/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing | | |
| September 2014 | Prevention and Inclusion Framework Contract Award | Wednesday, 04/03/15 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) | Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Chris Best, Cabinet Member Health- Well-Being-Older People | | |
| October 2014 | School Admissions 2015-16 | Wednesday, 25/03/15 Mayor and Cabinet | Frankie Sulke, Executive Director for Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People | | |

| Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee | | | |
|---|--|------------------|----------------|
| Title | Gang associated women and girls – prevention and awareness review: scoping paper | | |
| Contributor | Scrutiny Manager | Item | 5 – appendix D |
| Class | Part 1 (open) | 03 November 2014 | |

1. Purpose

- 1.1 At its meeting on 15 July 2014, when deciding on its 2014/15 work programme, the Committee raised concerns about violence against gang associated women and girls.
- 1.2 Additional information about Lewisham’s violence against women and girls (VAWG) strategy was provided by officers at the Committee’s meeting on 10 September 2014. Following consideration of the information provided and questioning of officers, the Committee resolved to carry out a review into the issue of gang associated women and girls in the borough, which would focus on preventative work and early intervention.
- 1.3 This paper sets out a rationale for the review¹, provides background information about violence against gang associated women and girls and puts forward terms of reference for discussion and agreement by the Committee.

2. Recommendations

The Select Committee is asked to:

- note the content of the report
- consider and agree the proposed key lines of inquiry for the review, outlined in section 8 and the timetable, outlined in section 9.

3. Policy context

- 3.1 Government’s *ending gang and youth violence programme* includes the ambition to reduce violence against gang associated women and girls. The Government report in 2011, which forms the basis of this approach, set out a range of actions to reduce youth violence, including²:
 - providing support to local areas to provide solutions;
 - preventing young people becoming involved in violence in the first place through early intervention and prevention;
 - developing pathways out of violence and gang culture for young people wanting to make a break with the past;
 - punishment and enforcement to suppress the violence of those refusing to exit violent lifestyles;

¹ The in-depth review process is outlined at Appendix A.

² Ending gang and youth violence: cross government report (2011) - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ending-gang-and-youth-violence-cross-government-report>

- partnership-working to join up the way local areas respond to gang and other youth violence.

3.2 *A call to end violence against women and girls* is the Government's violence against women and girls strategy. It also includes actions to tackle the dangers faced by gang associated women and girls. The Government's ambition, through the strategy, is to change attitudes, pursue prosecution against offenders and encourage targeted local action. The most recent update on the plan is set out in the 2014 action plan³, which details Government progress against its priorities across four key areas:

- Preventing violence
- Provision of services
- Partnership working
- Justice outcomes and risk reduction

3.3 Boys and men are disproportionately represented as both perpetrators and victims of gang violence, so it is often the case that the focus of interventions and activities to deal with youth violence centre on boys and men. Government recognises that:

'In focusing on the male perpetrators and male victims of gang violence it can be easy to lose sight of the role that young women and girls may have in gang-related activity, and the hidden impact of serious youth violence on them.'

(Ending gang and youth violence: cross government report, 2011 p18)

3.4 The Mayor's Officer for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) has developed a strategic framework⁴ in London for responding to violence against gang associated women and girls. The framework sets out the strategic direction for London Boroughs to tackle the dangers faced by gang associated girls and women across the city. Its aim is to:

'...support London boroughs and agencies in devising their strategic and operational responses to young women and girls involved in or associated to criminal gangs.'

3.5 The framework recognises that most interventions and activities to support gang associated women and girls are still in the early stages of development and it directs local areas to consider '...a range of different interventions targeted around different needs when commissioning services for gang-associated young women and girls.' Furthermore, it states that local authorities should consider working together to develop cross borough partnerships to provide specialist services (MOPAC 2013, p28-29). The framework provides a checklist of actions for consideration by London authorities and their crime reduction partners to coordinate and focus actions on reducing violence against gang associated women and girls.

3.6 Lewisham's sustainable communities strategy (2008-2020) sets out the vision of a borough where people feel safe and live free from crime, anti-social behaviour and abuse, where young people are protected and where communities live without the fear of crime.

³ A call to end violence against women and girls: action plan (2014)

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/287758/VAWG_Action_Plan.pdf

⁴ MOPAC strategic framework for responding to gang associated women and girls (2013):

http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Gangs%20and%20girls_strategic%20framework.pdf

3.7 The Safer Lewisham Partnership (SLP) which is Lewisham's Community Safety Partnership (CSP) brings together agencies in Lewisham to develop a coordinated approach to tackling crime and antisocial behaviour. The Safer Lewisham Strategy sets out multi-agency plans to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour in the borough, which are reviewed annually. The Partnership's 2014-15 priorities include the ambition to:

- Reduce key crimes with particular reference to VAWG and serious youth violence.

3.8 The Safer Lewisham Partnership has also developed a *violence against women and girls strategy* (2014-17) which sets out the following priorities:

- Tackling and reducing incidents of domestic violence and abuse year on year;
- Tackling and reducing rape and sexual violence year on year;
- Tackling sexual exploitation with specific focus on children.

5. Meeting the criteria for a review

A review of prevention work for gang associated women and girls meets the criteria for carrying out a scrutiny review, because it is:

- a strategic and significant issue;
- it affects a number of people living in Lewisham;
- the Council is in the process of tendering a service for the provision of services to prevent, and reduce the impacts of, violence against women and girls.
- the Council is required to make a major reduction to its budget, which will reduce resources available to community and voluntary organisations, public health, supported housing, youth offending and schools improvement services.

6. Gang associated women and girls

Definitions

6.1 Gangs, criminal networks and groups involved in antisocial behaviour may all have different features. Their activities, their membership and their areas of operation may change over time. Researchers, policy makers and practitioners may use differing definitions, leading to differing policy approaches. Some commentators (Runnymede 2008) believe that the problem of defining gangs stems from a fundamental failure in the definition of groups of young people and youth violence, which erroneously group together the behaviours and associations of too many different young people. Nonetheless, data used for the Mayor of London's '*strategic ambitions for London on gangs and serious youth violence*' indicates that the Metropolitan Police believe that there are 224 recognised gangs in London made up of about 3495 people⁵.

6.2 The Mayor of London uses the Centre for Social Justice definition of a gang as:

'A relatively durable, predominantly street-based group of young people who (1) see themselves (and are seen by others) as a discernible group, (2) engage in a range

⁵Mayor of London (2014) – Gangs and Serious Youth Violence :

http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Strategic%20Ambitions%20for%20London_%20Gangs%20and%20SYV%202014_0.pdf

of criminal activity and violence, (3) identify with or lay claim over territory, (4) have some form of identifying structural feature, and (5) are in conflict with other, similar, gangs.' (Centre for Social Justice 2009, p21)

- 6.3 At its meeting on 10 September the Committee heard from officers of the Council and Lewisham Police. It was reported that gang activity in Lewisham had largely moved beyond street gangs, which use violence in order to control territory, into looser criminal networks, which use violence and exploitation to drive the goals of their illegal businesses. This complicates the definition used by the Centre for Social Justice, which includes territory and street based activity as defining gang features.
- 6.4 The MOPAC strategic framework builds on the Centre for Social Justice definition by interpreting the territorial element of gang behaviour to include economic territory. It also recognises that gangs need not be street based. The Framework uses the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) definition of gang members as someone who:
- Identifies themselves as being a member of a gang and this is corroborated by information from more than one independent source
 - Is identified as being a member of a gang and this is corroborated by information from more than one independent source

6.5 All of the available information about gang membership demonstrates that, by these definitions, gangs are almost all entirely made up of boys and men.

6.6 MOPAC recommends that community safety partnerships (in Lewisham this is the Safer Lewisham Partnership) should adopt the ACPO definition of gang-associated women and girls to assist with the identification and assessment of women and girls at risk; the definition is as follows:

'a woman or girl who is a family member of or in an intimate relationship with a gang nominal'. (MOPAC 2013, p6)

6.7 The scope of this definition is important because there is some evidence that there are women and girls affected by gang violence who are unaware those family members, or men/boys they are associated with, are involved in gang related activity. Throughout the research and policy documentation it is recognised that there is a lack of information and accurate data about the number of women and girls affected by gang violence. This makes it unclear how much of the violence and exploitation of gang associated women and girls is hidden, or only partially reported.

The dangers of gang association

6.8 There have been a number of pieces of research which detail the negative impacts of violence and exploitation on gang associated women and girls.

6.9 In 2012 a study by Bedfordshire University found that violence, rape and sexual exploitation were common place in gangs. The study detailed the disordered relationships that are able to develop between gang members and gang associated women and girls. The research drew on accounts from women and girls to highlight the destructive and violent behaviours, which appeared commonplace in gangs and came to be accepted as the norm. The MOPAC strategic framework reports on this

study, highlighting that both inside and outside of gangs the patterns of violence are similar, in that women and girls are most often the victims of sexual violence and exploitation and that the perpetrators are most often, if not always, men. The Framework highlights the following areas of particular concern in the context of gang associated women and girls:

- pressure to engage in sexual activity;
 - engagement in sexual activity due to fear of force, violence (physical and/or sexual) and intimidation;
 - the recording and distribution of images of sexual activity via mobile technology;
 - sex as initiation into the gang;
 - sex in return for (perceived) status or protection;
 - sex as a means of achieving material gain;
 - young women “setting up” people in other gangs; and
 - cases of rape (single and multiple perpetrator) and other sexual assaults – as punishment, a weapon in conflict and/or for sexual gratification
- (University of Bedfordshire, cited in MOPAC 2013, p17)

6.10 Furthermore, the Safer London Foundation⁶ reports that the effects of gang violence reach a broad number of women and girls who are associated with gangs. The Foundation’s work highlights the dangers for women who are targeted for sexual assault as a means of conflict between boys/men in rival gangs.

7. Prevention

7.1 Government sets out its achievements⁷ in dealing with violence against gang associated women and girls since 2011 as:

- the creation of 13 Young People’s Advocates nationally to provide direct support to young people;
- funding to Against Violence and Abuse and the Women and Girls Network, to develop specialist services and training to 58 practitioners working with girls and young women affected by gang-related sexual and domestic violence, including the 13 Young People’s Advocates;
- a workshop for practitioners and an academic roundtable
- regional practitioner’s workshops with the Youth Justice Board to address the specific needs of gang-associated girls in the youth justice system

7.2 The Mayor of London has committed that, as part of its work to reduce youth violence, the London Crime reduction board will ensure that by 2017:

‘Access to prevention programmes in all London state schools and educational establishments will be available, enabling children and young people to make positive life choices. Every ‘at risk’ child will receive targeted support for a positive transition to secondary school Troubled Families, Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs and other family support and safeguarding mechanisms should understand and address gang issues (Mayor of London – Gangs and serious youth violence, p26)

⁶ Safer London Foundation, Gangs and Sexual Violence: <http://www.saferlondonfoundation.org/news/?p=445>

⁷ Gov.uk; women girls and gangs: <https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/reducing-knife-gun-and-gang-crime/supporting-pages/women-girls-and-gangs>

- 7.3 The MOPAC strategic framework for responding to gang associated women and girls recommends that services in boroughs for girls and women affected by gang violence should include:
- Prevention work/healthy relationships that covers gang-association and VAWG delivered in schools, pupil referral units and in out of school youth-based settings.
 - Early intervention and diversionary work such as mentoring and peer support to support young women on the peripheries of gangs.
 - Crisis support such as advocacy, exit provision that is safe and provided by women that addresses the holistic needs of young women and girls (as above).
 - Longer-term support such as specialist counselling to support young women and girls to overcome the trauma of gang-associated VAWG. Counselling services should be specialised as inappropriate responses can exacerbate the effects of sexual violence as they can damage the victim's positive sense of self or lead to higher levels of psychological symptoms and poorer recovery.
 - Interventions to promote self-esteem and confidence.
 - Education, training and employment opportunities tailored for young women and girls. A women-centred approach to education, training and employment should be about ensuring young women and girls have access to a broad and diverse range of opportunities and that appropriate systems and support are put in place to address their specific needs.
- 7.4 It is also recommended that work takes place in primary schools to identify young people at risk of becoming involved in youth violence.
- 7.5 Initiatives in Lewisham to tackle violence against gang associated women and girls are linked to broader violence against women and girls work. At the Committee's meeting on 10 September 2014, Members heard that the Safer Lewisham Partnership ensured that there was information sharing and advice between the different agencies to deal with violence against gang associated women and girls. Specifically, it was noted that the Ending Gang and Youth Violence team were working with the Youth Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference to develop good practice in strategic and operational planning. Members also heard that the Serious Violence Team worked with the Early Intervention Child Sexual Exploitation leads to ensure that there was a uniform approach by school safeguarding leads in responding to the needs of gang associated girls⁸.
- 7.6 The Council is in the process of commissioning a violence against women and girls service. The service will be responsible for providing support to women and girls who are affected by gang violence – but this will not form a separately defined strand of its work.
- 7.7 Prevention and awareness raising work in schools relies on the amount of time available in curriculum and is dependent on the priority that this work is given over other issues related to health and wellbeing.

⁸ Report to Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee, 10 September 2014:
<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s31046/04%20Violence%20against%20women%20and%20girls%20100914.pdf>

7.8 Home Office guidance on addressing youth violence and gangs⁹ in schools and colleges states that (for Ofsted inspections): 'In order for a school to be judged 'outstanding', all groups of pupils must':

- feel safe at school all the time;
- understand very clearly what unsafe situations are; and
- be highly aware of how to keep themselves and others safe.

(Home Office 2013, p4-5)

7.9 The guidance highlights the importance of assessing the likely effectiveness of prevention programmes and recommends varied approaches to delivering preventative work and carrying out targeted activity.

7.10 As part of the review it is recommended that the Committee should consider effectiveness initiatives used in other areas to tackle violence against gang associated women and girls, which might include:

7.11 Empower: <http://www.saferlondonfoundation.org/projectfull.php?p=14>

The Safer London Foundation runs a project called 'Empower' out of hubs in Hackney and Croydon. The project has six strands of activity:

- Young women's 1:1 intensive support
- Specialist advice & case consultations
- Young women's group education programme
- Young men's group education programme
- Parents & Foster Carers workshops
- Professionals training & events

7.12 Growing Against Gangs and Violence <http://www.gagv.co.uk/about>

An early intervention educational partnership with the Met Police that is provided to schools. It uses drama, debate, and discussions with young people in order to enable them to think critically about gangs.

7.13 Girls in Gangs: <http://girlsingangs.org/>

A school led approach to educating young people about the dangers of becoming involved in gangs, based in Manchester.

8. Key lines of inquiry

8.1 In order to successfully complete this review, the Committee will need to ascertain the following information:

- What data is available about the extent of issues affecting gang associated girls and women in Lewisham?

⁹ Home office (2013) addressing youth violence and gangs: practical advice for schools and colleges: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/226293/Advice_to_Schools_and_Colleges_on_Gangs.pdf

- What services exist to prevent women and girls from becoming associated with gangs?
- What is the pattern of take up of prevention services?
- What is the current level of resource for prevention services in Lewisham?
- Are there examples of effective practice in other areas?
- What are the future challenges to delivering successful prevention and awareness raising work?

8.2 Review questions:

- How do Lewisham and its partner organisations work to prevent women and girls from becoming associated with gangs?
- What could be done to enhance the effectiveness of work in this area?

8.3 Issues outside of the scope of the review:

- Dealing with individual cases or casework

9. Timetable

The Committee is asked to consider the outline timetable for the review as set out below.

3 December 2014

- Data from the Police Service on the number of women and girls affected by gang violence;
- Information from Council officers about prevention services in the borough.

22 January 2015

- Invitation to third party organisations (to be agreed) to share examples of best practice

4 March 2015

- Recommendations based on evidence collected and final report for submission to the Safer Lewisham Partnership and Mayor and Cabinet.

10. Further implications

At this stage there are no specific financial, legal, environmental or equalities implications to consider. However, each will be addressed as part of the review.

Sources

Beckett, H with Brodie, I; Factor, F; Melrose, M; Pearce, J; Pitts, J; Shuker, L and Warrington, C. (2012). Research into gang-associated sexual exploitation and sexual violence. University of Bedfordshire:

<http://www.beds.ac.uk/news/2013/november/research-highlights-extent-of-gang-related-sexual-violence-towards-children-and-young-people>

Centre for Social Justice (2013); girls and gangs:
<http://centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/UserStorage/pdf/Pdf%20reports/Girls-and-Gangs-FINAL-VERSION.pdf>

Centre for Social Justice (2009):
<http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/publications/dying-to-belong>

Ending gang and youth violence (2011); cross government report:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ending-gang-and-youth-violence-cross-government-report>

Government VAWG action plan (2014):
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/287758/VAWG_Action_Plan.pdf

Home Office (2013); addressing youth violence and gangs – practical advice for schools and colleges:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/226293/Advice_to_Schools_and_Colleges_on_Gangs.pdf

Mayor of London; strategic ambitions for London (2014); gangs and serious youth violence:
http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Strategic%20Ambitions%20for%20London%20Gangs%20and%20SYV%202014_0.pdf

MET Police; Trident FAQs (2014):
<http://content.met.police.uk/Article/FAQs/1400014987691/gangcrime>

MOPAC (2014); strategic framework for responding to gang associated women and girls:
http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Gangs%20and%20girls_strategic%20framework.pdf

Runnymede (2008); rethinking gangs:
<http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/RethinkingGangs-2008.pdf>

Runnymede (2011); gangs revisited:
[http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/GangsRevisited\(online\)-2011.pdf](http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/GangsRevisited(online)-2011.pdf)

Other information

Catch 22: <http://www.catch-22.org.uk/expertise/gangs/research-projects/>

Ms Understood: <http://www.msunderstood.org.uk/>

Empower programme: <http://www.saferlondonfoundation.org/projectfull.php?p=14>

Redthread: <http://www.redthread.org.uk/>


Background papers

Minutes of the meeting of Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee held on 10 September 2014

Violence against women and girls including girls and gangs report, Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee 10 September 2014

For further information please contact Timothy Andrew, Scrutiny Manager on 02083147916.

How to carry out an in-depth review



This page is intentionally left blank